```
1
 2
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                    FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
 3
 4
                                   CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
    IN RE: VALSARTAN PRODUCTS
 5
                                   1:19-md-02875-RBK-JS
    LIABILITY LITIGATION
 6
                                   ORAL ARGUMENT AND RULINGS
                                   ON DISPUTES RAISED IN
 7
                                   PARTIES' MAY 26, 2020
                                   LETTERS [DOCKET NOS. 439,
 8
                                    440]
                                    (Via telephone)
 9
         Wednesday, May 27, 2020
10
         Commencing at 11:00 a.m.
11
    BEFORE:
                             THE HONORABLE JOEL SCHNEIDER,
                             UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
    APPEARANCES:
13
         MAZIE SLATER KATZ & FREEMAN, LLC
         BY: ADAM M. SLATER, ESQUIRE
14
         103 Eisenhower Parkway
15
         Roseland, New Jersey 07068
         For the Plaintiff
16
         LEVIN PAPANTONIO
17
         BY: DANIEL A. NIGH, ESQUIRE
         316 S. Baylen, Suite 600
18
         Pensacola, Florida 32502
         For the Plaintiff
19
         GOLOMB & HONIK PC
20
         BY: RUBEN HONIK, ESQUIRE
         1835 Market Street, Suite 2900
21
         Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
         For the Plaintiff
22
23
               Karen Friedlander, Official Court Reporter
                      friedlanderreporter@gmail.com
24
                             (856) 756-0160
25
             Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
          transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
```

```
A P P E A R A N C E S: - CONTINUED
 1
 2
         KANNER & WHITELEY LLC
         BY: CONLEE S. WHITELEY, ESQUIRE
 3
              LAYNE HILTON, ESQUIRE
         701 Camp Street
         New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
 4
         For the Plaintiff
 5
         GOLDENBERG LAW PLLC
 6
         BY: MARLENE J. GOLDENBERG, ESQUIRE
         800 Lasalle Avenue
 7
         Suite 2150
         Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
 8
         For the Plaintiff
 9
         DUANE MORRIS LLP
         BY: SETH A. GOLDBERG, ESQUIRE
10
              ALEXANDRA WALEKO, ESQUIRE
         30 S. 17th Street
11
         Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
         For the Defendant ZHP and the Joint Defense Group
12
         PIETRAGALLO GORDON ALFANO BOSICK & RASPANTI LLP
13
         BY: CLEM C. TRISCHLER, ESQUIRE
         One Oxford Centre, 38th Floor
14
         Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
         For the Defendant Mylan and the Joint Defense Group
15
         GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP
16
              LORI G. COHEN, ESQUIRE
              VICTORIA DAVIS LOCKARD, ESQUIRE
17
         3333 Piedmont Road, NE, Suite 2500
         Atlanta, Georgia 30305
18
         For the Defendants, Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.,
         Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Actavis LLC, and Actavis
19
         Pharma, Inc.
20
         BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
              SARAH E. JOHNSTON, ESQUIRE
21
         2029 Century Park East, Suite 300
         Los Angeles, CA 90067-2904
22
         For the Defendant, CVS Health Co.
23
         ULMER & BERNE LLP
         BY: JEFFREY DANIEL GEOPPINGER
24
         600 Vine Street
         Suite 2800
25
         Cincinnati, OH 45202
         For the Defendant, AmerisourceBergen
```

```
1
    A P P E A R A N C E S: - CONTINUED
 2
         CIPRIANI & WERNER, P.C.
         JESSICA M. HEINZ, ESQUIRE
 3
         450 Sentry Parkway, Suite 200
         Blue Bell, PA 19422
 4
         For the Defendant, Aurobindo Pharma USA, Inc., Aurolife
         Pharma, LLC and Aurrobindo Pharma, Ltd.
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
              (ALL PARTIES VIA TELEPHONE, May 27, 2020, 11:00
 2
    a.m.)
              THE COURT: We're on the record. This is the
 3
    Valsartan MDL litigation, Docket No. 19-2875. The Court
 4
    understands that there are in excess of 35 or so people on the
 5
 6
            That's fine. The Court assumes only leadership
 7
    counsel is going to speak. For the benefit of the court
    reporter, please state your name before you talk. We'll get
 9
    their entries of appearance. If anyone else wants to speak,
10
    that's fine, just make sure you announce your name before you
11
    speak so the court reporter can take it down. But for
12
    purposes of the entries of appearance, why don't we just get
13
    leadership counsel to enter their appearances.
14
             So start with plaintiff.
15
             MR. SLATER: Good morning, Your Honor, Adam Slater
16
    for plaintiffs.
17
             MR. NIGH: Good morning, Your Honor, Daniel Nigh for
18
    plaintiffs.
19
             MS. WHITELEY: Conlee Whiteley on behalf of
20
    plaintiffs.
21
             MR. HONIK: Good morning, Your Honor, Ruben Honik for
22
    plaintiffs.
23
             THE COURT: And defendants.
24
             MR. GOLDBERG: Good morning, Your Honor, this is Seth
25
    Goldberg from Duane Morris on behalf of the ZHP entities and
```

1 defendants. 2 MS. COHEN: Good morning, Your Honor, this is Lori 3 Cohen with Greenberg Traurig on behalf of Teva and defendants, and also Miss Lockard, Victoria Lockard is on the phone as 4 5 well, and she may be speaking on some topics as in the past 6 conferences. 7 MR. TRISCHLER: Good morning, Your Honor, Clem 8 Trischler on behalf of Mylan Pharmaceuticals. 9 MS. JOHNSTON: Good morning, Your Honor. This is 10 Sarah Johnston on behalf of CVS Pharmacy and the retailer 11 defendants. 12 MR. GEOPPINGER: Good morning, Your Honor, Jeff 13 Geoppinger at Ulmer & Berne on behalf of AmerisourceBergen and 14 the wholesaler defendants. 15 THE COURT: All right. I think that's all the 16 leadership counsel. 17 Counsel, I received your letters. We have a meaty 18 agenda for this morning's call. We'll get through it. We're 19 on schedule for I think a two o'clock call with Judge Kugler. 20 There might be some issues in the letters that we're not going 21 to address on this call, we'll address this afternoon, but we 22 can address any issues the parties want to raise. 23 With regards to the letters, I would suggest we start 24 with the order in Mr. Slater's letter. I think that makes

sense, and we'll go through the agenda in the order that

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Slater set out. But, of course, if there's any issues that the parties want to raise on this call, they're free to. So let's start with Mr. Slater's letter. The first issue is the Aurobindo, Hetero production issue. Of course, the Court has no objection to the agreed-upon date for the relevant discovery and I think the only issue is when Aurobindo is going to produce its documents and if they're going to do a rolling production. Is that right, Mr. Slater? MR. SLATER: I think Ms. Hilton is going to address this one for us, Your Honor. MS. HILTON: Good morning, Your Honor, Layne Hilton on behalf of plaintiffs. Yes, that is correct. We had, in the context of meeting and conferring about the beginning of the relevant start date, we had proposed to both Hetero and Aurobindo a completion date for core discovery on I think June 25th. Both Hetero and Aurobindo asked for July 31st deadlines for completion of core discovery, and with respect to Hetero, we were amenable to such a request because Hetero made additional commitments to produce rolling documents by the dates that we set forth in our letter.

There was an open issue with Aurobindo. We had a meet and confer with counsel on Friday and we had made a request that we could -- if we could receive some commitments of dates certain by which we could receive some portions of their core discovery, you know, we may be amenable to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

July 31st date. But absent some commitment, we were concerned that we would receive everything on July 31st, and that's sort of the only outstanding dispute if -- unlike with -- sorry --THE COURT: Can I just ask a point of clarification, counsel? So it sounds like you have everything worked out with Hetero. Are they going to make a rolling production between whatever date it starts and July 31st? Is that what you agreed to? MS. HILTON: Yes, Your Honor. And Hetero has actually, prior to even the commencement of the discussions with them about the relevant start date, Hetero had been producing core discovery, I believe, in April and in May. we had already received some core discovery from them, and so I think the only -- and I'll let counsel for Hetero speak on that. The only -- you know, we have some outstanding things that they had collected that are in line for production, but because we had agreed to a January 1st, 2011 start date for the relevant period, there were some additional documents they had to go back to their client and collect, and that was why they asked for a July 31st completion date. THE COURT: So is it fair to state that at least with regard to Hetero, the parties have an agreement or understanding about the date documents are going to be

produced, with a completion date of no later than July 31st?

1 MS. HILTON: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Aurobindo counsel, what say you? 3 MS. HEINZ: Good morning, Your Honor, this is Jessica 4 Heinz for Aurobindo Limited. I had a good meet and confer 5 with Layne Hilton. We discussed exactly what she said. We 6 are open to a rolling production probably similar to what 7 Hetero has agreed to. I just don't -- I'm waiting on confirmation from my clients about how soon we can get the 9 documents that they've asked us to prioritize. 10 I was hoping I was going to hear from them before the 11 conference today but I have not yet. So I'm still hopeful 12 that we can agree to rolling production deadlines before 13 July 31st and have that be the final deadline. Unfortunately, 14 I haven't heard from them yet. 15 (Cross talk.) 16 THE COURT: Counsel, here's the Court's ruling. 17 have said in the past that Aurobindo, at least its related 18 companies, as the Court understands it, has been aware of this 19 litigation for months. It's been aware of the Court order 20 regarding core discovery, and we're going to hold Aurobindo's 21 feet to the fire. They knew about this conference, they had an opportunity to get in touch with you. I don't know why 22 23 they didn't. 24 The Court's order is going to provide that Aurobindo 25 has to provide a rolling production as of June 30th, July 15,

```
1
    with a completion date of no later than July 31st, okay?
 2
    That's what the Court's order is going to say.
 3
             This has been going on too long. It's time to close
    this loop and it will be closed no later than July 31st.
 4
 5
             Next issue.
 6
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
             MS. HEINZ:
 7
             THE COURT: The API and Manufacturing Defendant Fact
 8
    Sheets.
             Obviously, this is a meaty issue. And let's see if
 9
    we can address it.
10
             Not quite sure how to do it, but Mr. Slater, just
11
    globally, what -- I read the letter. Help the Court
12
    understand globally what the issue is. Is the issue that
13
    defendant doesn't want to answer these questions in the fact
14
    sheets because they say they're going to produce the documents
15
    and plaintiffs can get the information from the documents, and
16
    if so, what questions are we talking about so we can
17
    specifically address them.
18
             MR. SLATER: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll just --
19
    I'll answer the global question then when we get into the
20
    specifics. Two other members of our executive committee will
21
    walk through the specifics if we have to get that done.
22
    That's really, as Your Honor frames it, the main holdup is
23
    that there were several questions where we're trying to trace
24
    the medications back or the drugs back to particular lots and
25
    batches which should be able to be done, and to be able to
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

figure certain information out, such as, you know, date of manufacture and things like that, which will help us for important product ID issues for the liability case. And really, we hope for this compromise to try to help you cut to the chase on this, to say, look, if you don't want to tell us exactly what the answer is, at least don't make us rustle through the entire forest to find out which tree answers this question, and we did a test case during the meet and confer where the defense sent a spreadsheet that would help to answer one of our requests, and we said, well, why don't we model this that way going forward so you at least tell us which spreadsheets or which documents the answers are in so that we save a lot of time, we don't risk having incomplete or inaccurate answers. And really, nobody is the worse for wear if we have certainty and we move through their efficient state.

We're not sure if the defense is accepting that because they haven't gotten back to us on the specific request, and we were hoping that was a good compromise.

THE COURT: One of the issues or problems that I'm wrestling with is I'm trying to understand how this fits with Paragraph 5 in the order the Court entered on January 28th, Docket No. 360. That particular paragraph was recited in defendant's letter where the Court took a middle ground about this product tracing issue.

1 I don't quite have my arms around how that 2 Paragraph 5 relates to this fact sheet issue, if it does. 3 Are they apples and oranges or are they related? 4 (Cross talk) 5 MR. SLATER: I think it is, to some extent, apples to oranges, because again, we're not asking for a reproduction of 6 7 anything. We're not asking for a duplicate production of anything. We're asking, through the DFS, as Your Honor is 9 well aware, to link up on a case-specific level, specifics of 10 a plaintiff's case and where the document production will be 11 millions of pages, it makes a lot more sense for the parties 12 to be on the same page as to which information specifically 13 applies to a specific plaintiff. 14 THE COURT: Okay, I'm -- should the -- is the best 15 way to approach this to look at the particular questions at 16 issue? I'm still trying to --17 MS. WALEKO: Your Honor, if I may, just one second, 18 this is Alex Waleko of Duane Morris on behalf of the ZHP 19 defendants. I'll be addressing this issue on behalf of the 20 manufacturer defendants today. And I think possibly the most 21 efficient way to get to this issue is if I could have a chance 22 to explain what the manufacturer defendant has agreed to 23 provide at this point in time and kind of describe what 24 exactly what the dispute is, and then I do think it makes 25 sense to go through these particular disputed questions and

```
1
    the redlines that we attached to our filings, because they are
 2
    the kind of specific issues about each of the questions.
             THE COURT: Counsel, that's fine. I think that's a
 3
 4
    good idea, just to sort of -- to preface what we're going to
 5
    talk about.
 6
             Are the questions at issue what you set out at Page 8
 7
    of your letter, are those the questions at issue?
 8
             MS. WALEKO: Let me see what Page 8 says.
                                                         Those
 9
    are -- those are some of the questions that here we also
10
    attached a redline as Exhibit D. To start, I think it helps
11
    us to first explain the types of information that the
12
    manufacturer defendants had already agreed to provide.
13
             The questions that are not currently in dispute,
14
    which are shown in Exhibit D and Exhibit E are the questions
15
    that go towards what we've been calling product identification
16
    information.
17
             As Mr. Slater just mentioned, one point that's the
18
    main goal with this fact sheet is to try to trace the
19
    individual pills that each plaintiff received upward through
20
    the supply chain all the way down to the specific batch of
21
    APIs that ended up in that plaintiff's pill.
22
             And to do that, the manufacturers have agreed to
23
    provide product identification information and that is
24
    information such as the lot and batch number for the Valsartan
```

-- the date of manufacture, the date of sale, the customer,

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the date of expiration, et cetera, that type of data that would facilitate plaintiffs in their goal of trying to trace that product through the supply chain to identify who are the relevant defendants, who manufactured this product, and --THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, could I ask for some clarification here? So you've said you're going to identify -- well, the defendants are going to identify the lot, batch number, customer. Does that -- in the first instance, are you talking about the plaintiff has to identify for you some initial information for you to provide that information? MS. WALEKO: Yes. That's been plaintiff's plan and -- with the way that the supply chain works in the generic drug market, the idea is that plaintiff currently proposed four fact sheets directed toward the four different levels of the supply chain. So one towards the retailers, one to the wholesalers and then one to the finished dose and API manufacturers, one to each of them, respectively. And the idea is that the retailers will start with the information provided in the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and the retailers will respond to their own Defendant Fact Sheet and then the wholesalers will go next and they'll use, you know, that cumulative information and then answer their own fact sheets and so on up the supply chain for the API manufacturers, with the idea being that obviously the API

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
manufacturers have no way to tell independently on their own
which specific consumer in the United States received API from
which particular batch. The idea is to trace this information
up the supply chain. So the caveat being --
         THE COURT: Okay, so -- can I stop you there,
Counsel? Get back to a question I asked.
         Are we talking about the individual/plaintiffs who
are going to be identified pursuant to Paragraph 5 of that
order I mentioned?
         MS. WALEKO: Yes, yes.
         THE COURT: Okay. So there is a relationship between
Paragraph 5 and the fact sheet then, right?
         MS. WALEKO: There is. And, Your Honor, going back
to Paragraph 5 of the fact sheet. This dispute about the
appropriate scope of the fact sheet, you know, it goes all the
way back to January before the Court issued that ruling.
you know, this might sound like somewhat of a similar dispute
and that's because this is the argument at that January case
management conference.
         The Court already heard this issue and the Court, you
know, decided it and whether it is the Defendant Fact Sheet to
this product identification information.
         THE COURT: Okay. So in the first instance, there's,
what, how many people, approximately, are going to be
identified in Paragraph 5, about 40 plus or minus are we
```

```
1
    talking about?
 2
             MS. WALEKO: I think -- my understanding of the total
 3
    of Paragraph 5 would come to 54 plaintiffs because it is the
    class representatives of which I believe there are 24 economic
 4
    loss and 10 medical monitoring and then Paragraph 5 also
 5
 6
    allows 20 personal injury plaintiffs.
 7
             So 24, 10 and 20 is 54.
 8
             And one point on that I did want to mention that I
 9
    think it is very critical context for why the manufacturers
10
    are so concerned about --
11
             THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on, Counsel.
                                                      Before we
12
    get to arguments, please let me understand the whole
13
    background, okay, because it will help me understand your
14
    argument.
15
             Now we have 54 plaintiffs and pursuant to the order,
16
    these 54 plaintiffs are going to produce, in my words, every
17
    piece of paper they have regarding the Valsartan, et cetera,
18
    prescriptions they got, right? Whatever product ID
    information they have is going to be produced to the
19
20
    defendants, right?
21
             MS. WALEKO: Correct.
22
             THE COURT: All right. In the first instance, the
23
    retailer is going to answer -- well, who answers first, the
24
    retailer defendant?
25
             MS. WALEKO: That is my understanding of the plan,
```

```
1
    Your Honor.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay. Retailer defendants answer as to
 3
    these 54 people and then it goes up the supply chain
 4
    eventually to the finished dose manufacturers and the API
    manufacturers, right?
 5
 6
             MS. WALEKO: Correct.
 7
             THE COURT: And what plaintiff is looking for is
 8
    whatever traceability information the manufacturers have that
 9
    relate to the product that these particular plaintiffs got
10
    from, say, Walgreens or a Walmart, right?
11
             MS. WALEKO: Correct.
12
             THE COURT: Okay. So at least with regard to the
13
    product ID traceability information we're talking about, we're
14
    talking about the manufacturers only, quote unquote, my words,
15
    only have to address at least in this initial stage,
16
    hopefully, information just for these 54 people, right?
17
             MS. WALEKO: Yes, and there is -- I would like to add
18
    some context to that.
19
             THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to turn the floor
20
    over to you. You explain the defendants' position and now I
21
    can better understand your argument.
22
             MS. WALEKO: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor.
23
             So as I mentioned, the manufacturers have agreed to
24
    provide that type of product identification information that
25
    would allow the plaintiff to trace their product to the supply
```

7 plaintiffs, they've probably received several hundred bottles
8 of Valsartan and this product identification exercise would

have to be performed for each of those bottles to confirm where did they come from, et cetera.

And so even though the world of plaintiffs has been annexed at this point to 54 plaintiffs, this will be quite a burden of exercise that the manufacturers have already agreed to engage in and have agreed to answer questions in the fact sheet.

Now, where the dispute is --

THE COURT: Can I ask you a question, Counsel?

MS. WALEKO: Sure.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: In order for your clients to try and attempt to do this traceability analysis, will you be getting the information you need? In other words, if you get a batch number, you know, some sort of number from the retailer up the food chain, can your client then trace it to a particular batch, when it was made, where it was made?

MS. WALEKO: That is -- I think there are two --

really two questions there. The first and easier question is, if we, if we as the manufacturers deal with these, the lot and batch number from the wholesaler or the retailer, then yes, we can provide additional information. If we have the lot or batch number, we can answer questions about when that lot or batch was manufactured, to whom it was sold, the expiration date, the date of sale, et cetera.

However, the main question, though, is can the manufacturers or retailers provide that lot or batch number information to the manufacturers, and my understanding is that the Wholesaler and the Retailer Fact Sheets are still under negotiation. I think this is an issue that's going to come up or has come up in their macro discovery briefing that's not been completed yet.

But my understanding is that the industry does not track lot and batch number in this way, and so the manufacturers have agreed to provide this information and have continued their good faith negotiations about what the scope of their Manufacturer Defendant Fact Sheet should be.

But this product tracing project may ultimately prove quite difficult, if not impossible. And so that is one of the issues as to that case.

THE COURT: Two questions for you. In order for your clients, the finished dose and the API manufacturers, to provide the traceability information that plaintiffs are

looking for, what is the absolute minimum information you must -- your clients must have to do the search? Is it a lot or batch number? Is it something else? And clearly, if that information is not provided to your client, can't your client just say, we can't do it?

MS. WALEKO: It is -- I believe that we cannot answer both of these questions without receiving the lot and batch number from responses and other areas, other Defendant Fact Sheets. And that is actually why -- we have designed the fact sheets so that we do answer right off the bat, yes/no whether the manufacturers are able to identify the lot and batch number based on the information that they have received, and plaintiffs have agreed to those questions.

And, I mean, just for more context, the reason that this product tracing becomes so complicated is based on the records I've seen from the ZHP defendants, ZHP manufactures multiple batches and multiple lots per day and sells to many customers, and so without that type of precise lot and batch information, it honestly -- it does become really complicated and product identification could be a hole that is very difficult for the plaintiffs in this case.

THE COURT: It seems to me that this is a pretty critical area and I'm querying you whether you said you think the lot and batch number is the minimum information you need.

Have you rolled up your sleeves with your clients

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

under the difficult circumstances we're all working with to give a definitive answer to the Court and the plaintiffs that at an absolute minimum, no question about it, unless we have the lot and batch number, we can't give you what you want? Are you prepared to make that representation to the Court and to the plaintiffs? MS. WALEKO: Yes, Your Honor. My conversations with our client, their level of visibility then goes down to when they sell a batch of API to another client like Teva or Torrent, they don't even know that that's a big guide in use in the United States market. That's really where their visibility ends. So without lot and batch information, at the very least -- I mean, I think it is impossible for defendants to provide this type of plaintiff-specific, this is the pill that ended up in this plaintiff's hands in New Jersey information. THE COURT: Okay. So, I interrupted you. If you want to continue, Counsel. MS. WALEKO: Sure. I think I was just getting to framing where the real dispute is, because I mentioned we have agreed to provide and answer these product identification questions, to the extent we're able to, from the information we've received, from the supply chain and plaintiff. The dispute here is that plaintiff wants the defendant actually to go beyond these product identification

questions and also requires the manufacturer to then review their own productions and identify other categories and other specific documents that are potentially relevant to that plaintiffs' case.

So, for example, the manufacturers have agreed to identify, say, the, you know — the manufacturers have agreed to provide the product's identification information. Once they just have that information, they can go and find — review those testing results that the manufacturers produced and identify the particular tests that they believe relates to their case, and the object of this dispute is what the manufacturers maintain that the fact sheets should be limited to product identification which, as Your Honor mentioned, is a critical issue and it will be a very burdensome and difficult issue for the manufacturers and all of their defendants, but truthfully, the Defendant Fact Sheet that the manufacturers have agreed to is already going to be a time-consuming process.

And then beyond product identification, we believe that it's plaintiffs' burden to look through the documents, identify what they believe is relevant to their case, especially because once they have this product identification information, they are equally able to sort through the productions and find the specific documents that they're interested in.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think, getting back to Your Honor's question about Paragraph 5 of the January 28th order, and if this probably sounds familiar and it's because it was the same dispute that was at issue in January, and it is our position that the Court has already ruled on this and at that time, the manufacturers had actually asked the Court to forego the fact sheet entirely, because all of this information that plaintiffs are requesting, including the information visibility necessary to trace product and show product ID would be available to plaintiffs in the documents that the manufacturers are producing. THE COURT: Okay. Can I stop you there, Counsel? MS. WALEKO: Sure. THE COURT: Because maybe we ought to get into the specific questions at issue, but let me take in your letter, Mr. Slater's letter, what seems to me to be the clearest issue, and I'm referring to Page 6, Section D. Defendants want to know the date of the recall notices, right? I could be wrong, but I would suspect that your clients can press a button and get a printout of that very easily. I'm getting the impression from the plaintiffs that your clients are going to produce thousands if not millions of documents and you want them to look through those documents to pick out the recall notices and to prepare charts of the dates. To me, that makes no sense.

and had been updated.

So let's use that as an example. Let's just use the recall notices as an example of -- bless you.

Plaintiffs want to know the date you sent the recall

notices. What's so hard about that? What's wrong with that?

MS. WALEKO: Sure, Your Honor. Well, the finalized recall notices first — that were finalized in conjunction with the FDA, they have already been produced through core discovery and the plaintiffs have that information, they know the date at which each defendant announced their voluntary recall. That is also information that's available on the FDA's website. And it's available, historically, too, so plaintiffs can see the date that that recall first announced

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question. One of the disputes that we're going to get to later on this call is defendants want plaintiffs to list their medical expenses. What's the difference? Plaintiffs say, we produced the medical bills. You can find out for yourself what the expenses are. What's the difference between that issue where the defendants want the plaintiffs to list their medical expenses and here, the plaintiffs want the defendants to list the dates of the recall notices; what's the difference?

MS. WALEKO: Sure, Your Honor, I think there are two differences. One that's more legal and one that's more practical. The first difference is that we're requiring the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

plaintiffs to tally up their medical expenses. consistent with the plaintiff's obligation in every case to do a calculation of the damages that they're seeking, and then second, from a more practical standpoint or an efficiency standpoint, I think there's obviously a difference to having each individual plaintiff type up, you know, calculate the damages they're seeking and provide that information in a -in a, you know, in one spot, versus having the same small group of defendants to answer the same question not just 54 times, but potentially, you know, 250 times because they have to do it 42 times per plaintiff. And so it's kind of a question of where is the most efficient place to allocate that burden, given the nature of these cases and the types of questions that are being asked. THE COURT: Counsel, I'll give you an A-plus for a valiant try, but in the Court's view, there's absolutely no difference between what the defendants are asking the plaintiffs to do and what, at least as to this one example, and what the plaintiffs are asking the defendants to do. Anyway, what's the best way to proceed now? Do we go to the particular questions at issue? MS. WALEKO: I think so, Your Honor. I think it makes sense for everyone to look at Exhibit D to the defendant's filing because there are some unique issues, and

if the Court is inclined to order that the defendants actually

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
can include from it the disputed questions, there are some
specific issues with each question as to the wording that
might be changed, and I also think, you know, maybe the
question that the dates of the recall notices might be -- it
has a different burden than some of the other questions that
are in dispute.
         THE COURT:
                     I picked the easiest example.
                                                    I have --
I have Exhibit D and E in front of me.
         Could we address E first? I defer to you.
         MS. WALEKO: Sure, Your Honor. I think, I think
Exhibit E makes sense because the finished dose manufacturer
version is almost identical except it has a couple of extra
questions in it.
         THE COURT: Okay. Let's go one by one.
                                                  We'll hear
your argument, we'll hear Mr. Slater's argument and we'll get
a ruling.
         MS. WALEKO: Sure. The first redline that you'll see
on the first page of Exhibit E is about the time to respond.
         THE COURT: Let me just -- oh, 90 days.
                                                 Let's save
that. Let's deal with the substantive issue. We'll deal with
the timing issue later.
         MS. WALEKO: Okay. Then the next issue on the second
page of Exhibit E as we go through these levels on the side,
the first question is asking the defendants to identify the
nitrosamine testing performed on the accepted API, and this is
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-- again, this is an example of the type of information that is equally available to plaintiffs once they have the product identification information and the type of information that becomes, you know, an unfair burden on the defendant to kind of -- to respond to the same question multiple times for plaintiff and over and over again on -- ultimately, it is plaintiff's burden to prove their own case and to find these documents. THE COURT: Let me just hear from Mr. Slater. just want to make sure. With regards to this particular question, we're only, in my words, "only" referring to the information that the 54 plaintiffs were going to provide. that right? MS. WALEKO: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. So before we turn it over to Mr. Slater, in the normal course of things, when a defendant produces documents, if this Court asks all plaintiffs, I don't mean to limit it to defendants, defendant or plaintiffs, to require the parties to identify the responsive Bates numbers to the request. So if the Court did that for this question, it would effectively be the same, wouldn't it? MS. WALEKO: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I don't think I fully understood what that question was. THE COURT: If I understand the issue right, and I'm making this up. Plaintiffs are going to -- I'm sorry,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendants are going to produce, I'm picking a number, 200,000 testing documents, okay? Not all of those -- some of those but not all of those relate to the products of the 54 plaintiffs. Defendants want plaintiffs to go through those 200,000 documents to identify the testing relevant to the 54 plaintiffs. Is that right? MS. WALEKO: That's right, Your Honor, and I think this is an excellent example, too, of the benefit that plaintiffs received 200,000 test results, and I think that might be high. ZHP, for example, has manufactured about a thousand batches of Valsartan API under its --THE COURT: No, I said documents. (Cross talk.) MS. WALEKO: So that was -- the plaintiffs would like the defendants to go through for each lot or batch that the plaintiffs received and it might be 30 different lots or batches over the course of several years that they took the drug and pinpoint each testing result that that -- that applied to that plaintiff product. And I think that's a great illustration of how it burdensome it is for the defendants to answer even one of these fact sheets because if you remember that at the same time, you know, defendants have to be focusing on working up their own defenses and working up their own cases, and what this type of question is doing is shifting the burden of

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
finding the relevant documents and proving plaintiff's case to
the defendant, and it's something that's going to be
incredibly difficult, especially with the pace that the Court
wants to get these cases resolved.
         THE COURT: I want to -- before I turn it over to
Mr. Slater, I just want to make sure I got it right.
         Hypothetically, I'm making this up, there's 200,000
pages of documents regarding testing that the defendants have
      That's all the -- that's the universe of testing
documents. Some of those 200,000 documents relate to the 54
plaintiffs, but not all of them.
         Defendants' position is that the plaintiffs should
look through those 200,000 documents to try and find the
documents that relate to the 54 plaintiffs that we're
concerned about. Is that what the defendants' position is?
         MS. WALEKO: Yes.
         THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Slater, let's hear from you.
         MR. SLATER: Judge, as they do in the Congress, I'm
going to give up my time to Ms. Goldenberg and Mr. Williamson
on our executive --
         (Court reporter asks counsel to repeat.)
         MR. SLATER: I'm handing off, Your Honor, to
Ms. Goldenberg and Mr. Williamson who are prepared to argue
the specific points here, so I don't want to -- it's their
issue, so I'm going to hand off to them, if that's okay.
```

1 THE COURT: Sure. 2 MS. GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, this is Marlene 3 Goldenberg. Good morning. And I think, you know, you kind of 4 hit the nail on the head. We're not asking them to itemize a number of things for us. We're really just looking for them 5 to go to plaintiffs, the right place. You know, if these 6 7 documents have been produced, then that's it, it makes their job a lot easier and they can just give us a base number, but 9 it's not always clear, you know, which document relates to 10 which batch, and to ask us to just jump in and guess at that, 11 it's really a waste of our time when we are trying to be 12 efficient and move towards trial specifically. 13 So if we're able to just resolve this quickly by 14 having the defendant say, here's where you get this 15 information and it's only for 54 plaintiffs, that seems like a 16 reasonable compromise for both sides. 17 THE COURT: The first issue we're dealing with, 18 Ms. Goldenberg, is Roman Numeral II, capital D on Page 2 of 19 Exhibit E. 20 Does that particular question relate to this issue 21 that we're -- we've been talking about for the past few 22 minutes? 23 MS. GOLDENBERG: And I just want to make sure I'm in 24 the same place as you, Your Honor. Exhibit E, Section II, 25 Sub D as in dog, is that right?

```
1
                               That's the same issue we've been
             THE COURT: Yes.
 2
    dealing with.
 3
             MS. GOLDENBERG:
                              Right.
 4
             MR. SLATER: Marlene, it's Section B actually.
 5
             THE COURT: No, it's Roman Numeral II, capital D.
 6
    I'm in the redline version, Exhibit E.
 7
             MR. SLATER: I apologize, Your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT: D as in dog.
 9
             MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes. I think the short answer, Your
10
    Honor, is that your section is yes, it all relates to what we
11
    were just talking to. It's our understanding, especially with
12
    the defendants being in the superior place of knowledge of
13
    understanding how this works and where the testing was done,
14
    you know, if this were an individual case, we could just order
15
    an interrogatory or a request for production and they would be
16
    required to identify these documents by Bates number.
17
             So I don't think that we're adding any additional
18
    burden to what would normally be expected in a litigation.
19
             THE COURT: The Court's ruling on this issue is that
20
    the defendants' objection is overruled. The Court struck a
21
    compromise between the party's respective positions when it
22
    limited the number of, in my words, traceability analysis that
23
    had to be done. We started with apparently the number 54 now,
24
    which is a fair compromise, given the scope of the case.
25
             The defendants haven't established that this would be
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an undue burden, and in the normal course of things when defendants produce documents, voluminous documents, which they undoubtedly will in this case, it's this Court's practice and I think it's in accordance with the case law, to require parties to identify the Bates numbers of the particular documents that are responsive to a particular request. So there would be no additional burden by, in the Court's view, having the defendants respond to the particular inquiry as an issue. So the objection to Roman Numeral II, D, Page 2, as we just argued, is overruled. Next issue, defendant. MS. WALEKO: So, this next -- the next redline on this page actually I think -- I think there might not be a dispute about this one or -- this one question asks for the date of manufacture two times, and so the defendants deleted the second time it asked for it. But I'll let Ms. Goldenberg clarify, if that's okay. MS. GOLDENBERG: As long as you did it once, we're fine. MS. WALEKO: Yes. Okay. So I believe the next disputed issue is on the third page of this exhibit. And unfortunately, it looks like we deleted several sections and they got lumped into a single comment bubble here.

So, Your Honor, the first question here, if you read that comment bubble, it says: "Identify the data you collect and store as part of electronic data interchange 867 charge-back report."

(Cross talk.)

MS. WALEKO: That is -- my understanding is that it is -- that it is an electronic platform used that some companies may use to handle purchase orders and charge back other transactional data, and our position on this question is a little different than what we had been arguing for the past few minutes.

Although plaintiffs try to phrase this question as something plaintiff-specific, we get data fields and a type of data stored through this electronic data interchange is not a plaintiff-specific question and it is an issue that is being handled and should be handled through the meet and confers regarding sales and pricing information.

In fact, the original document request that the plaintiffs served on the manufacturers requested similar data fields and charge-back reports. Those were formerly Request No. 109 and 111 and plaintiff withdrew those requests before the requests were finalized by the Court, and so our position is that this information is more appropriately handled through the sales and pricing negotiations and also specifically withdrawn from the frontline document requests, and those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
should be handled through those ongoing meet and confers about
the types of sales and pricing information that the plaintiffs
need on a global basis.
         THE COURT: Plaintiff?
         MS. GOLDENBERG: This is Marlene Goldenberg.
going to popcorn to Layne Hilton or Dave Stanoch on this one.
         THE COURT: You're going to have to hurry up and talk
before the Court --
         MS. HILTON: Your Honor, Layne Hilton on behalf of
plaintiff. I haven't looked at this but, you know, my
understanding is we are in the process of meeting and
conferring on the global sales and pricing data. And so to
the extent that the request is something that defendants
intend to negotiate with us on an aggregate basis in a good
faith manner, I think, you know, we are amenable to that.
         But as will be discussed later on, I quess in the
hearing, you know, we have some general issues with the sales
and data production and so, you know, with the proviso that
whatever the Court decides or rules on with respect to the
aggregate sales and data production, you know, I think we are
open to having those meet and confers.
         THE COURT: Objection sustained on the defendants.
         This should not be included in the fact sheet but
we'll reserve the discussion of this particular issue when we
```

get to the sales and pricing discussion.

1 Defendant, next issue. 2 MS. WALEKO: Sure. The next question, Your Honor, is 3 a little past that little paragraph symbol in the bubble and 4 it starts with: "State whether you supplied each test result identified in response to Question II(B) for the FDA to any 5 6 other entity or person, et cetera." 7 I think this question initially fell within the 8 defendants' position that this is the type of information that 9 plaintiffs are equally capable of identifying, but 10 understanding that Your Honor has overruled that objection, I 11 think there are parts of the language here that need to be 12 changed. One, is that it says: "To any other entity or 13 person, e.g., your actual or prospective customers or 14 15 defendants." We maintain that that should be edited to say: 16 "Your actual customers or defendants." 17 THE COURT: "Prospective customers" is certainly an 18 overbroad term that really doesn't belong in these fact 19 sheets. 20 That could be anybody, right? 21 MS. WALEKO: Yes, and it's overbroad and it's vaque 22 so we do think it should be limited to "actual customers or 23 other defendants," to the extent that their not just one and 24 the same. 25 THE COURT: Agreed. Agreed. Aside from that, is

```
1
    there any -- knowing the Court's ruling previously, is there
 2
    any other objection to this particular question?
 3
             MS. WALEKO: Not for that particular question, Your
 4
    Honor.
 5
             THE COURT: Okay. The next question is:
                                                      "The dates
 6
    of the recall notices." Can you tell the Court why this
 7
    should not be included, other than you think plaintiffs should
    look through defendants' documents, the documents that the
 9
    defendants are going to produce, because the Court is inclined
10
    just to order the defendants to produce this because it's just
11
    so easy.
12
             MS. WALEKO: Sure, Your Honor, that was our objection
13
    to this question. So I understand the Court's ruling on that.
14
             THE COURT: Objection overruled as to the recall
15
    objection.
16
             Next question is: "Identify all drugs to have
17
    recalled or otherwise identify it as actually or potentially
18
    contaminated."
19
             I mean, don't we know what drugs have been recalled?
20
    Isn't that basic information everybody knows?
21
             MS. WALEKO: Well, Your Honor, our position on this
22
    question is it is actually duplicative of several of the other
23
    questions of the Defendants' Fact Sheet. So the other
24
    questions -- you know, the question right before it says:
25
    "Provide the date on which you sent the recall notice that
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

apply to any of the affected drugs," meaning the drugs that this plaintiff took. So that question already answers whether the affected drug was recalled, and similarly, the second half of Section F, defendants should identify if the drugs were, quote, actually or potentially contaminated. And that's answered by the identification of the testing information. think the testing results speak for themselves, and there would be, you know, what constitutes, quote, contamination in terms of -- it's a disputed issue in this case and so, the defendants' burden at most should be to identify those testing results, not to take a stance on what contamination means. And I'll also note that the plaintiffs did agree to delete this question from the API's Defendant Fact Sheet, but it is still in the finished dose one. THE COURT: Plaintiff, do we have a dispute about

this?

MS. GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, I think that we can probably work to merge the information into another question so that we don't have anything that's duplicative. But, from our standpoint, it's our understanding that they haven't tested every batch. So what we're looking for here is their knowledge about whether or not a particular batch was contaminated or was not, and that's going to be an important issue for us later, if they're going to take a position that only some of this was affected. It would be important for us

```
1
    to know if that's going to be their position early on.
 2
             But, if their position is that if something is
 3
    recalled, then it is probably contaminated, I think we can
 4
    live with that and we can merge that into another question.
 5
             (Cross talk.)
 6
             THE COURT: I don't want to take the wind out of your
 7
    sails, defendants, but the defendants have made their position
    clear throughout the course of this litigation, so there's no
 9
    need for you to repeat what you already stated a thousand
10
    times.
11
             MS. WALEKO: Thank you, Your Honor.
12
             THE COURT: This question: "Identify all affected
13
    drugs that you have recalled or otherwise identified as
14
    actually or potentially contaminated."
15
             I mean, everybody knows what drugs have been
16
    recalled, so I don't see why that has to be answered again,
17
    and "actually or potentially contaminated" is just too broad.
18
             Objection sustained.
19
             Let's go to the next question: "Were any drugs
20
    returned to your possession as a result of a recall letter."
21
             Plaintiff, what are you getting at here?
22
             MS. GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, this is aimed at helping
23
    us understand whether or not the pills in the particular lot
24
    or batch that were taken by our clients still exist and
25
    whether or not they might be available for testing.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: Well, why don't you ask them -- why don't
 2
    you ask it that way?
 3
             (Laughter)
             MS. GOLDENBERG: We can if that would be easier.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: I mean, you stated it so clearly on the
 6
    phone.
 7
             MS. GOLDENBERG: Sometimes I get it right on my
 8
    second try.
 9
             THE COURT: I think you're entitled to know if
10
    samples of the same exact drugs is limited to the 54
11
    plaintiffs are existing. I mean, both sides probably want to
12
    know that. So if you could phrase the question as clearly,
13
    Ms. Goldenberg, as you just discussed on the record, that
14
    would be great.
15
             MS. GOLDENBERG: I would be happy to, Your Honor.
16
             MS. WALEKO: And, Your Honor, just two points on this
17
    as well. So question also 8 asks for the date that the
18
    defendants regained possession of the drug and also the
19
    current location. We don't think that those issues are
20
    relevant and they just become, you know, one extra piece of
21
    information that we would be required to answer over and over
    through each Defendant Fact Sheet.
22
23
             And second, I did want to note that the API
24
    Manufacturer Defendant Fact Sheet asks this question about the
25
    API and finished dose affected drugs, and so that language I
```

```
1
    think needs to be corrected on that fact sheet.
 2
             THE COURT: You mean as opposed to just the 54
 3
    plaintiffs?
 4
             MS. WALEKO: No, we asked the API manufacturers
    whether any finished dose drugs were returned to them, and I
 5
 6
    don't think that makes sense to ask the API manufacturers --
 7
    makes sense to ask that of the finished dose manufacturers.
 8
             THE COURT: As opposed -- okay. You think it's the
 9
    question that the finished dose people have to answer and not
10
    the API people?
11
             MS. GOLDENBERG: I think it ends up as to the
12
    finished dose.
13
             Alex, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think
14
    what you're saying here is the API should only have to answer
15
    if API was referring to the finished dose manufacturer should
16
    only have to answer if they refused the finished dose product
17
    back?
18
             MS. WALEKO: Correct. Thank you, Ms. Goldenberg.
19
             THE COURT: I agree with that. I don't think the API
20
    people should have to answer if something went to the finished
21
    dose manufacturing people. The finished dose people are going
22
    to answer that question.
23
             MS. GOLDENBERG: Certainly we only want each
24
    manufacturer to have to answer about what they have in their
25
    own possession. We aren't sure if there might be a customer
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. WALEKO: Yes, Your Honor. The next issue is actually reflected in the redline to Question G. Starts about how to answer only if plaintiffs answer yes. The question --THE COURT: Yes, I understand this question. how I think it should be dealt with. I'm looking for the easiest way out. The plaintiffs should speak to their clients and ask them if they've been in contact with any other defendant, and if the answer is yes, the plaintiffs should identify those individuals for the defendants and the defendants should search for the information they have regarding those contacts. I think that makes so much more sense than having the defendant search 54 people when it would be so much easier for the plaintiffs to identify which of the 54 the defendants have to search for information. So what I'm saying is, Plaintiffs, the burden is on you in good faith to talk to your clients. If they answer yes, that they've been in contact with any of the defendants regarding the recall, et cetera, give those names to the defendants and then the defendants have to search for the responsive information regarding that contact. I think that's a fair compromise on this issue.

Any objection, Defendants?

MS. GOLDENBERG: No, Your Honor. That's the position we were advocating for and that's what Question III.B.7 in the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plaintiffs' Fact Sheet asks the plaintiffs whether they have ever contacted any of these defendants. So that's what that language was designed to capture and I think Your Honor --THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry, is that already in the Plaintiffs' Fact Sheets? MS. GOLDENBERG: That question is in the Plaintiffs' Fact Sheets. THE COURT: Oh, great. So then it's simple, you get a positive answer to that question because the answer is going to be under oath, the defendant should then search for those particular plaintiffs which, at best, is a subset of 54. to believe that all 54 contacted the defendants, maybe a handful did, but if so, they did under oath then. It seems reasonable to require the defendants to track down those communications. MS. GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, I think from the plaintiffs' perspective, if I could just tell you why we care about this. What we're trying to avoid is, you know -- or we want to make sure that -- ideally, before trial, we want to make sure we have an understanding of what information the defendants have on our clients, and sometimes contacts can go one way from the manufacturer to our clients in the form of I've had clients send me letters that they've gotten from the manufacturer where the manufacturer has requested that they send the pills back or that there are some kind of

offers to, you know, and that come with forms that they want to sign where this might waive their legal rights if they send their pills back and get a certain amount of money from the manufacturer.

To the extent the defendants have tried to reach out to our clients and that's, you know, a one-way communication, I think that we're entitled to any information that they have concerning our clients or any attempts they've made to get in touch with them, and that's the reason that we had pushed back on this question.

THE COURT: Well, I agree that if the defendants reached out to the plaintiffs, you need to get those communications, but, in the first instance, the plaintiffs should check with their clients whether that, in fact, occurred, because this way, the defendants don't have to search 54 people when they may not all be relevant to your question.

If the plaintiffs have a client who says, yeah, I remember getting communications or a form letter from the defense, from somebody, but I really can't say who it was or when, then the defendants would have to search.

But if the plaintiffs say, no, I never received any communication, why should the defendants then search for that particular person.

MS. WALEKO: Your Honor, this is Alex Waleko again.

I think that's correct. And one other thing I'd like to point out is, one of the finalized document requests does require the manufacturers to produce all communications that they sent to any consumers in the United States. And so — this particular question, too, seems like something that plaintiffs are actually better equipped to look at those documents and determine whether, you know, it's their name or their address in any of those communications.

MS. GOLDENBERG: Yeah, I mean, there has been instances where if a defendant has an address wrong for a plaintiff, or they have an e-mail address wrong, they might have served that communication and our client might not have gotten it.

What I don't want to have happen is we get to trial and the defendants raise something, like, well, we tried to reach out and tell them that maybe they should stop taking those drugs and the communication never made it to our client and we've never gotten that document because our client didn't know it was supposed to reach them.

THE COURT: The Court ruled on this issue. We're in speculation territory now, Plaintiff. If your client represents that they received a communication from the defendant that they don't have a copy or can't track it down, the defendant has to search for that, and if there's a particular plaintiff who answers in their fact sheet that,

```
1
    yes, they were contacted by the defendant or, yes, they
 2
    communicated with the defendant on their own, then the
 3
    defendant has to search for the communication.
             But the burden in the first instance is on the
 4
 5
    plaintiff to identify those particular plaintiffs who had
 6
    communications.
 7
             Next issue, are there any?
 8
             MS. WALEKO: There are more, Your Honor. The next
 9
    issue is the comment bubble that's all the way at the bottom
10
    of this Page 8. Search for personal injury cases.
11
    the question about alternate causes.
12
             THE COURT: Are you on Exhibit E?
             MS. WALEKO: Still on Exhibit E.
13
14
             Oh, I'm sorry, Page 3. I was looking at the wrong
15
    page number.
16
             THE COURT: Okay. Where should I be looking for this
17
    particular question? Oh, here it is. I have it.
18
             MS. WALEKO: This is the question to defendants to
19
    identify alternate causes and this question is just --
20
             THE COURT: Doesn't this have to be provided in your
21
    defendants' expert report?
22
             MS. WALEKO: Yes, our position is that it's premature
23
    to answer -- to see the Defendant Fact Sheet and that should
24
    be answered and provided at the same time as the expert
25
    report. So we would --
```

```
1
             (Cross talk.)
 2
             THE COURT: Objection sustained. The question is
 .3
    deleted.
             Next issue.
 4
 5
             MS. WALEKO: The next issue is that same comment
 6
    bubble, you'll see it starts with the header "Documents."
 7
             THE COURT: "We get these," blah, blah, blah.
 8
             MS. WALEKO: And actually, unfortunately, the bubble
 9
    got cut off because it was -- I think it's because it was too
10
    long, but there were four or five document requests at the end
11
    of the fact sheet and defendants, all of them, are covered by,
12
    you know, the very fulsome document requests that the Court
13
    has already finalized regarding the manufacturers, and so our
14
    position is that we should not be --
15
             (Cross talk.)
16
             THE COURT: This is Judge Schneider. Objection
17
    sustained. I think we already went through the document
18
    request long ago. It was fulsome, extensive. It's hard to
19
    conceive that there are documents that are included with this
20
    fact sheet draft that haven't already been requested, so
21
    objection sustained.
22
             Does that take care of Exhibit E?
23
             MS. WALEKO: Yes, Your Honor, that takes care of
24
    Exhibit E other than the time to respond which you were going
25
    to return to.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about that.
         Plaintiffs, what say you?
         MS. GOLDENBERG:
                         I'm sorry, on Exhibit E, Your Honor?
         THE COURT: Yes. The fact -- when do the defendants
have to answer the fact sheet? What's plaintiffs' position?
         MS. GOLDENBERG: So, we had originally proposed 30
days, defendants proposed 90. We had offered to compromise at
45, but they're holding at 90. The problem with the 90-day
turnaround, Your Honor, is that we're looking at three
different 90-day periods that each of the defendants was
awarded this amount of time to answer, and then we're going to
be looking at nine months before any single plaintiff has a
completed Defendant Fact Sheet, and that just seems like too
long, especially since we were to crystallize the issues today
on the phone call and simplify what the defendants have to
provide.
         I think that 45 days for each level of this is more
than sufficient time.
         THE COURT: Is it envisioned, Ms. Goldenberg, that
the retailers are going to answer within 45 days and then 45
days after that, the next group, and 45 days after that, the
next group. Is that what you envision?
         MS. GOLDENBERG: We have -- and someone can correct
me if I'm wrong, but my understanding is that the retailers
and the wholesalers are supposed to answer together at the
same time followed by the finished dose manufacturers, 45 or
```

```
1
    90 days later, followed by the API manufacturers, 45 or 90
 2
    days after that. So it's a three-tier process.
 3
             THE COURT: Okay. Retailers, wholesalers first, then
 4
    the finished dose manufacturers, then the API manufacturers?
             MS. GOLDENBERG: Correct.
 5
 6
             THE COURT: Okay. What is the trigger for the 45
 7
    days? Let's talk -- suggest 45 days. Let's talk about an
 8
    exact date. What do plaintiffs propose?
 9
             MS. GOLDENBERG: So plaintiffs propose -- so the
10
    triggering event, to answer your first question, is the
11
    completed Plaintiff Fact Sheet by the plaintiffs. So the
12
    plaintiffs serves the Plaintiff Fact Sheet, it goes to all the
    defendants and that starts the clock on the first tier of the
13
14
    Defendant Fact Sheet for the wholesalers and pharmacies.
15
    that would be -- let's start with --
16
             THE COURT: So it would be 45 days from -- this will
17
    be attached to a Court order approving the fact sheet, right?
18
             MS. GOLDENBERG: Correct.
             THE COURT: Okay. So let's hear defendants'
19
20
    position.
21
             MS. WALEKO: Sure, Your Honor. Our position is that
22
    this type of granular and very detailed information is going
23
    to be quite difficult for the defendants to collect and
24
    provide, and so that's the reason that we're asking for 90
25
    days. And again, it's important to remember that even though
```

that there's 54 plaintiffs, we really have to do this product ID exercise and now also identify additional documents multiple times for each of those 54 plaintiffs and so that will be a time-consuming process.

And because the trigger date will be first the completion of the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and that, you know, for each supply chain level, the completion of the Defendant Fact Sheet for the preceding supply chain defendant, what's going to end up happening is that likely most if not all of these Defendant Fact Sheets will have to be answered at one time because we are so much farther ahead with the Plaintiff Fact Sheets right now.

And so the defendants are looking at a situation in which they're asked to provide this detailed information for, you know, each of the 25 -- out of the pills that each of the 54 plaintiffs received more or less at the same time, and that's obviously going to be an incredibly time-consuming process and so 90 days really is necessary.

And I would also add that I actually think -- I've been on all of the meet and confers, I don't think plaintiffs ever actually proposed to us 30 days. Until about two weeks ago, the dispute was between 60 days and 90 days and then the plaintiffs recently changed it to 45 days.

And I will also mention that the defendants actually in Benicar, the timed response to that fact sheet was 60 days

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
and that was a much less complicated fact sheet, because it
really just asked for, you know, dear doctor letters and
communications with the plaintiffs' physicians because that
was a branded drug at issue.
         And so here we have a fact sheet that it's much more
complicated and that will require a lot more time and energy
for the defendants to answer, and so to give us 90 days is
reasonable and, frankly, necessary.
         THE COURT: I have a question for you, Defendant.
         With regard to the information that the plaintiffs
have to provide in the first instance, hasn't that
information, for the most part, already been provided?
         MS. WALEKO: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear Your Honor.
Could you repeat that, please?
         THE COURT: Yeah. I agree with you, there's some
background noise. Whoever is not speaking, could you please
put your phone on mute and that would help the court reporter
and all of us.
         But, Defendants, with regards -- the 54 plaintiffs in
the first instance, they had to produce all their product ID
information, right?
         MS. GOLDENBERG: Correct.
         THE COURT: For the most part, hasn't that already
been done?
        MS. GOLDENBERG: I believe that's been done through
```

the Plaintiff Fact Sheet where they're required to attach pharmacy records and photos of any bottles or labels that they have in their possession.

THE COURT: The Court will give 60 days from the date of the Court order approving the fact sheet to respond to the fact sheet.

I agree with you, that this is a more complicated situation than Benicar, no question about it, but on the other hand, I don't have the exact dates in front of me. But in Benicar, it just seems like the whole procedure went along so much smoother that it didn't take as long as it took to finalize the fact sheet.

Defendants have been on notice for quite some time about the general nature of the information that they're going to have to produce. They should have already produced it. We have granted the defendants' and plaintiffs' concessions on timing and I just think it's time that we try and bring this all together. You've been before this Court before.

If there's good cause when we get to 60 days for a particular extension, you can make your application. If we start with 90 days, it will push out to 150 days or 120 days. So I think 60 days is a fair compromise. Even with that, it's still going to take, at best, six months to get all this information. So 60 days it is.

MS. JOHNSTON: Your Honor, this is Sarah Johnston for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the retailer defendants. Can I just ask for a clarification? THE COURT: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: So the -- as Your Honor knows, the discovery process for the downstream defendant is trailing that of the manufacturer defendant than we are. We've been in the process of negotiating the macro discovery issues and the Rule 34 requests which have been teed up till the end of June, that it is our understanding that plaintiffs had tabled the discussion of the DFS for the retailer defendants until after the Rule 34 macro discovery issues have been decided.

So we -- I believe, since our last decisions on that DFS, which was back in March and have not received revisions back, with the understanding that the issue of tables already worked on Rule 34 issues.

So I understand and I recognize Your Honor's rule regarding 60 days for completion of the fact sheets that are currently under discussion, but I think it may have been premature to determine the length of time that it's going to take to respond to the fact sheets that is -- it's still very much in draft form, at least for the retailer defendants.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's make sure this is clear on the record. Is it agreed with the plaintiff that the retailer/wholesaler fact sheets, whenever they're finalized, in the first instance are going to be produced first and then after that, then the finished dose manufacturers go, and then

```
1
    after that, the API manufacturers have to answer.
 2
             Is there general agreement on that?
 3
             MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
             MR. GEOPPINGER: Your Honor, Jeff Geoppinger for the
 5
    wholesaler defendants. Generally speaking, that sounds
 6
    agreeable other than Ms. Johnston pointed out the downstream
 7
    defendants don't have a fact sheet to be looking at at the
    moment. But in the order of things, that seems certainly the
 9
    reasonable way to go.
10
             Obviously, the content of that fact sheet may affect
11
    that, assuming there's not something that we would actually
12
    have to have from somebody upstream to answer the questions
13
    they have. But if that's the order of proceedings and the
14
    fact sheet matches with it, that seems like the reasonable way
15
    to go.
16
             THE COURT: All right. There's general agreement on
17
    that.
18
             And then we have to decide the macro issues for the
19
    downstream parties, which if things go according to plan,
20
    we're going to finalize those at the end of June, and is it
21
    correct that the retailer/wholesaler fact sheets will not be
22
    finalized at least until after the, quote unquote, macro
23
    issues are resolved?
24
             MS. JOHNSTON: This is Sarah Johnston, Your Honor.
25
    Yes, that's correct.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. So what is wrong with saying that 2 whenever the retailer/wholesaler fact sheets are finalized and 3 the Court enters the order approving that, they have to be 4 answered. What's wrong with that? What am I missing? 5 MR. GEOPPINGER: Your Honor, Jeff Geoppinger for the 6 wholesalers. And just, Your Honor, the only caveat to that is 7 obviously we're going to bring it, your suggestion of 60 days 8 which seems like enough time, but I just mention that we're 9 saying that in the abstract because we don't know exactly 10 what's in that fact sheet yet. But certainly, once the fact 11 sheet is entered, we will be certain at some point it needs to 12 be answered in 60 days seems, in the abstract, like enough 13 time, but again, that will all depend on what's actually in 14 that fact sheet. 15 So I would only say from our perspective and 16 Ms. Johnston may have more to add on this, but that we would 17 like to, you know, reserve our right on that date -- or that 18 time period, depending upon what the fact sheet ultimately 19 looks like. 20 THE COURT: The order is going to say 60 days. 21 Next issue. 22 MS. WALEKO: Your Honor, this is Alex Waleko again 23 and I just -- this might have been just covered but I wanted 24 to clarify to make sure we're on the same page because it is

important. I just wanted to clarify that the trigger for the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
60-day deadline for the manufacturers -- for the finished dose
manufacturers will be the completion of the -- for the -- you
know, the completion of the wholesaler and retailers' response
to their fact sheet, not the entry of the Court's order
finalizing the Manufacturer Fact Sheet.
         THE COURT: You are correct, Counsel.
         MS. WALEKO: Okay, thank you.
         THE COURT: If there is a consensus that we're going
to go in this order, but that's the fact sheet, that's
different than the document production.
         MS. WALEKO: Correct. Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay. So your client has all the time in
the world now to get themselves in order about how to search
for these documents and where to look, et cetera, et cetera,
and they're going to have months and months to do this, so the
Court will be hard-pressed to understand how the fact sheets
can't be answered within 60 days of the trigger date, given
that it has months and months and months before that date has
been triggered.
         So why don't we go to the next issue, and if I'm
correct, are we now up to Page 8 of Mr. Slater's letter
regarding the sales and pricing information?
         MS. WALEKO: Your Honor, this is Alex Waleko again.
I'm sorry to bring us back to the fact sheet, but there is one
unique question to the API fact sheet, which is Exhibit D, not
```

```
1
    Exhibit E. And understanding the Court's -- well, it is
 2
    Page 2 of Exhibit E.
 3
             THE COURT: Got it.
             MS. WALEKO: And it's the fourth comment bubble down
 4
 5
    that says: "For each affected API, identify whether any
 6
    solvent used was" --
 7
             THE COURT: Yes.
 8
             MS. WALEKO: This is again a question that is -- I
 9
    think it is uniquely burdensome among all of the questions
10
    that have been asked in the Defendant Fact Sheet. So we --
11
    you know, the defendants -- the manufacturers object to this
12
    question on the same basis that they had objected to --
13
             THE COURT: Why is it burdensome, Counsel?
14
             MS. WALEKO: Well, as it's currently written, it's
15
    asking about any solvents and there are -- each manufacturer
16
    uses a different set of solvents but there are multiple
17
    solvents, not all of which are particularly relevant to the
18
    issue, and also, this type of information is actually, at
19
    least from my understanding of my own client's records, is not
20
    kept in one document. So this will actually require the
21
    defendant to go through manufacturer records that are quite
22
    long and complicated to identify the supplier of the
23
    particular solvent used in that batch of API.
24
             Because the way this works is that the drug master
25
    file actually discloses the names of the solvents, you know,
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
their chemical names, and then the approved suppliers of those
solvents, but then identifying the particular solvent -- the
particular solvent -- the supplier for the solvent used on any
given day is not something that's retrievable by the push of
the button.
           It's actually quite difficult based on the way
that these records are kept.
         THE COURT: Hold on, Counsel.
         Am I correct, Plaintiff, by reading your letter, that
you have offered to compromise and only list the solvents that
would be relevant to the contamination we're talking about in
this case? Am I correct about that, Plaintiffs?
         MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay. So the defendants' objection is
overruled with the proviso that plaintiffs are going to
sharpen their pencils and identify the particular solvents at
issue as represented in their letter. Okay?
         Does that take care of Exhibit E?
         MS. WALEKO: Yes, and we're definitely finished with
the fact sheet, Your Honor, thank you.
         THE COURT: Oh, great. Thank you, Counsel.
         The sales and pricing documents. Can I give you my
general thoughts on that. It seems to me that this is a very,
very important issue to the case and I want to make sure the
Court has its arms around this issue and gives it sufficient
time.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
I need some time to digest this information and I
would suggest that we just have a separate call, just about
this one particular issue and only with the parties who the
issue concerns, and I'd like to proposes a date maybe next
week to give the parties additional time to meet and confer
about the sales and pricing information. I think it would be
productive to give you more time to meet and confer and to
have a call just on this one issue because I can see how
important it is to the case.
         I suspect we don't have any objection to that?
         MR. GOLDBERG: No objection from defendants, Your
Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay. With regard to the people who are
at issue with regard to the sales and pricing information,
would it be possible to have a call next Wednesday, June 3rd,
at 4:00 p.m.?
         (Cross talk.)
         MR. SLATER: -- on the plaintiff's side. Everyone
else?
         MR. TRISCHLER: My apologies, Your Honor. Clem
Trischler for Mylan Pharmaceuticals. I have depositions
actually in Minneapolis set that day. Would it be possible to
do it at 4:30, and there's a reasonable chance I'll be
concluded by then?
         THE COURT: I have no objection. Anyone else?
```

1 That works for ZHP. MR. GOLDBERG: 2 THE COURT: Okay. 4:30 on June 3rd. Just one issue, 3 the sales and pricing deficiency issue, only with the parties 4 who need to be involved in that discussion. I was giving some thought to whether we should have individual calls, but it 5 6 seems to me that some of the issues overlap, so it might be --7 it is more productive, I think, to have all the interested parties on the same call, okay? So we'll deal with the sales 9 and pricing information next Wednesday. 10 If there's any -- if you meet and confer over the 11 next week, if there's any additional information you think the 12 Court should see before that call, feel free to send it along. 13 I'm going to make sure that I'm up to speed on the issue and 14 give you -- can give it appropriate thought and consideration, 15 okay? 16 Then we're up to Issue No. 4, the macro issues. 17 There's not much to discuss there. Because we have the 18 briefing schedule on the argument, so we can skip over that. 19 Prioritization, I've read the issue. I don't 20 understand why there's a dispute about this, quite frankly. 21 think it makes perfect sense for the plaintiffs to identify 22 the documents that they're most concerned about. In fact, 23 that's what the defendants have been asking for, and why is 24 there a problem prioritizing the production, Defendants?

MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, this is Seth Goldberg for

defendants. I don't think there is a problem. We provided a letter to plaintiffs on Friday. We invited them to have individual meet and confers with each of the defendants because the prioritization is somewhat of an individualized issue, given that we all maintain our documents in different ways and some documents may be easier to get at than others for some defendants and it may be different for others.

But we have invited them to have that meet and confer and we intend to work through with them how to prioritize. They've expressed their preference and each defendant will assess that with plaintiffs and hopefully get to the point of having some agreed upon -- if not agreed-upon prioritization, at least a sense of how the information will flow out.

Keep in mind that the Court ordered back in mid-April plaintiffs to provide a letter on prioritization and for defendants to use good faith to produce documents in a prioritized way. So I don't see that there is a dispute.

There is the need to have the individual meet and confers now.

THE COURT: Mr. Goldberg, I have your May 22nd letter from Ms. Hilton in front of me where you suggest these individual meet and confers. Well, one, I question

Ms. Hilton's letter was written May 7th, why hasn't this been done already? And two, I don't see any particular objection by any particular defendant to what Ms. Hilton proposed. Just a general, we need to talk about it.

```
1
             MR. GOLDBERG: Yeah, I think you're right, Your
 2
            We don't have a dispute.
    Honor.
             THE COURT: Tell me what --
 3
 4
             MR. GOLDBERG: Well, I don't think there is any -- I
 5
    think the question is simply, if you look at Mrs. Hilton's
    letter, for example, they have set out a priority order,
 6
 7
    contracts and agreements, API manufacturing, quality assurance
 8
    documents, finished dose manufacturing quality assurance
 9
    documents, foreign regulatory documents. Many of these have
10
    already been produced, for example, the foreign regulatory
11
    documents have already been produced.
12
             THE COURT: Good, good.
13
             MR. GOLDBERG: So I think what we envision, what we
14
    would like to do is go through this prioritization with
15
    plaintiffs on an individual basis to determine if -- for ZHP,
16
    it might be easier to prioritize contracts and agreements
17
    verses quality assurance, but for Torrent, it might be easier
18
    to prioritize quality assurance over contracts and agreements
19
    just because of how the information is kept.
             And so we have no dispute about the notion of
20
21
    prioritizing, it's just that -- how each specific defendant
22
    prioritizes needs to be paired to how the information is kept
23
    at that defendant --
24
             (Cross talk.)
25
             THE COURT: This is Judge Schneider. I'm going to
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
The Court's going to order that the priority --
make it easy.
that the defendants have to exercise reasonable good faith
efforts to prioritize their production in accordance with
Ms. Hilton's letter. This issue has been going on for a
couple of weeks. I don't want it to go on for another couple
          If there's a particular problem, I'm sure you'll
work it out with defendant -- with plaintiff.
         The Court's order is saying reasonable good faith
efforts have to be expended. Here, plaintiffs did precisely
what the Court ordered them to do. They were very specific
about their priorities. On its face, it appears reasonable,
and it's going to be approved.
         If you have a particular problem, work it out with
the plaintiff and I expect all parties to be reasonable.
         Next issue is the plaintiff's leadership structure.
I think we'll discuss that this afternoon on the call at 2.
don't anticipate any problem.
         Plaintiff Fact Sheets. Defendants, what do we do
here? I think, if I remember right, there's a 38 or 40-page
list of deficiencies?
         MS. LOCKARD: Your Honor, this is Victoria Lockard
from Greenberg Traurig. So first of all, there is a -- there
are chart deficiencies. Plaintiffs' team were deficient.
have met and conferred with the plaintiff.
         At present, none of these plaintiffs are ripe for a
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
show cause order. We have 36 of them out of, you know, over
250 personal injury plaintiffs. We would like to appear on
initial cause list at the June 26 --
         (Court reporter asks counsel to repeat.)
         MS. LOCKARD:
                       250 personal injury plaintiffs.
currently have 36 that would be like next month -- and I'm not
on speaker, but let me know if there's a problem.
         So we had our meet and confer. I believe there are
two key issues yet to be resolved by the Court today that
allow us to further narrow down --
         (Court reporter asks counsel to repeat.)
         MS. LOCKARD: There are two issues that I think the
Court could resolve today that would help us narrow down our
list. In the first you'll note is the authorizations being
provided. Now, keep in mind, Your Honor, we have about 4/5ths
of the Plaintiff Fact Sheets have complied, even though what
we're seeing appears to be a rate exists, by and large, the
majority of plaintiffs have complied now, pretty much made
their complaint, but we have about a fifth of them who we have
identified as sufficient, and we -- the process is working.
We went through our meet and confer, we eliminated some of the
more trivial deficiencies.
         We agreed, I believe, to alert what would be
considered core deficiencies and we shared that list with
plaintiff's counsel and that really is what's driving the list
```

that you have.

But the key issues that you could particularly help us with us today are the authorizations first and foremost. In some cases, you have given a blank authorization without any specification of a provider. They're in the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and specifically provide that each plaintiff needs to provide an authorization for each provider and, you know, this was heavily negotiated, Your Honor, in the call back in July of last year where you had detailed conversations about which providers plaintiffs would provide authorizations for.

So their position now for those individuals is appropriate, is directly contradictory to what they said back in July which was they want a tight control over these providers, that they want authorizations for just a limited number, those treating the cancer and those treating the hypertension and the primary care physician primarily. And because it was mentioned in that way, then they were talking about a minimal burden on plaintiff to provide the canceled authorization. But I --

THE COURT: I got it, I got it, I got it.

Plaintiff, what say you?

MR. NIGH: Your Honor, this is Daniel Nigh. I think it's classified and characterized -- I don't agree with the characterization on what has been listed as a core deficiency in any way, or the number of plaintiffs. I think what we're

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
seeing in terms of the number of plaintiffs that are showing
up right now are just the number of plaintiffs that are,
frankly, would have ripened to this state, because that was
the number of cases on file back then. So if --
         THE COURT: Could I ask a question, Mr. Nigh?
         MR. NIGH: Yes.
         THE COURT: If the defendants had said, for present
purposes, nobody has to be listed on an order to show cause,
so put that aside. Counsel said there's two issues that are
ripe for decision, and from reading the papers, I agree.
         The first issue, can you speak just to the
authorization issue.
         MR. NIGH: Absolutely.
         THE COURT: I think defendants are saying they want
authorization for each individual provider rather than one
generic authorization. They've cited the approved fact sheet
which talks about each provider. So tell me why the Court
should order the plaintiffs to comply with the Court-approved
fact sheets.
         MR. NIGH: Well, because I'm reading the PFS right
here, and I think what they are saying is they're providing a
blank authorization and signing that authorization and giving
the defendants permission to include which providers they want
to include in that authorization. They're saying that's a
core deficiency, and I disagree, because they have all the
```

information that they have where they could, you know, depending on which health providers they want to go out and request information from, they can fill that into that blank authorization.

There is nothing in the authorization sections I'm reading that suggest that that would be incomplete. It's not. It gives them every ability to say, you have the ability to fill in the health care providers that you want to fill in and they can do that.

Now, there are some plaintiff law firms who want to be a little choosier and direct specifically who the defendants can request from, and those plaintiff law firms can have that ability to where they can say, you can only request from these health care providers and they only provide them those limited authorizations. But if anything, providing a blank authorization for them to be able to fill in gives them even more capability to be able to request the providers that are listed in the Plaintiff Fact Sheet. So that's not exactly --

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Nigh.

And on this particular issue, the Court rules in defendants' favor. It's perfectly reasonable for the defendants to ask for a specific medical authorization. I don't know why the plaintiffs wouldn't want that. It gives them protection. I don't have the fact sheet in front of me,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
but from the language counsel read, it requires individual
authorizations. So the Court ruling on that particular issue
is that those authorizations have to be provided.
         Second issue, Counsel?
         MS. LOCKARD: Second issue is a medical description,
computation and that is on Page --
         (Court Reporter asks counsel to repeat.)
         THE COURT: I didn't hear, let me interrupt here,
Counsel. We've gone over --
         MS. LOCKARD: Go ahead.
         THE COURT: I ordered the defendants to provide the
specific information that plaintiffs asked for. I'm ordering
the plaintiffs to provide the specific information that the
defendants are asking for. Defendants want a breakdown of a
list of the medical expenses. It's entirely reasonable to
provide that information. It's relevant. Defendants
shouldn't have to dig through and compile their own list, so
defendants' request is granted. They want a summary of the
medical expenses claimed. It has to be provided.
         I don't mean to take the wind out of your sails,
Counsel, but we've been at this for a while.
         MR. NIGH: Your Honor, I think there's one additional
issue, though, that's current here in terms of medical
expenses. So a lot of law firms do not order medical expenses
because it's not relevant in a products liability case
```

```
1
    oftentimes at this stage. So the way that a lot of law firms
 2
    are responding to this question is saying, we don't have
 3
    medical expenses. That's the answer, you know, at this point.
             So if they have them, we agree that they can itemize
 4
 5
    them and send those to the defendants is the way it's asked
    for in the PFS, but to then say that somehow the defendants
 6
 7
    have to -- or the plaintiffs have to go out and get those
    documents that they don't have, that's not required by the
 9
    PFS.
10
             THE COURT: Well, let's do this, then. Absolutely,
11
    hundred percent, each of the class representatives has to
12
    summarize and list the medical expenses that they're claiming
13
    in the case. To me, that's a no-brainer.
14
             MR. NIGH:
                        I agree.
15
             THE COURT: I guess the question is whether that
16
    should be required of every plaintiff in the case at this time
17
    of the case.
18
             Defendants, can I hear your position on that? You're
19
    going to get --
20
             (Cross talk.)
21
             THE COURT: Go ahead.
22
             MS. LOCKARD: It's Victoria Lockard, for the record.
23
    Yes, so we believe that every plaintiff or an individual
24
    personal injury plaintiff should have to provide this.
25
    significant information. We need it produced, assessments
```

that we're doing for these cases. It's elementary in any personal injury case. It just has to be provided, such so that it's part of the Entry 6 initial disclosures, it's the third item on the list, a computation of any damages being claimed in the case.

So it may be that it's common practice for plaintiffs in this litigation not to order their records, the daily records, but just hit the documentation and evidence they need to prove their case, but it shouldn't be and that's not what is provided under the federal rules, it's not what was discussed for this Court in July last year, and it's not what is provided in the Plaintiff Fact Sheet.

We negotiated this, we put in a chart here, we didn't hear anything back about, you know, at the time plaintiffs can't provide this information. It's part of the essential core information they need to prove their case and we're entitled to it.

THE COURT: Can I ask for your indulgence, Counsel.

Are you able, relatively easily, to point me on the docket

where I can look at the fact sheet and a particular relevant

section, whatever those fact sheet says, that has to be done,

we're not going backwards.

I'm not in the office, so I don't have the fact sheet in front of me handy, but can you put your fingers on where in the docket the Court can look at the fact sheet? Does anyone

```
1
    recall the date that that particular order was entered?
 2
             MR. STANOCH: ECF 249, filed on 10-3-19, CMO 68,
 3
    Approving Plaintiffs' Fact Sheets, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. I have it right in front of me.
 4
 5
             MS. LOCKARD: It should be around Page 17 of where
    the explicit listing is.
 6
 7
             MR. NIGH: And, Your Honor, we spoke on multiple
 8
    occasions that this is a request for information, but the
 9
    plaintiff doesn't have the information. That doesn't
10
    necessarily -- I mean, they can be asked to request
11
    information but plaintiff doesn't have it. That doesn't
12
    require them to then go and seek out that information to
13
    respond to Plaintiff Fact Sheets. That was never envisioned.
14
             THE COURT: Mr. Nigh, I think the law at least with
15
    regard to documents is if documents are in your custody,
16
    control, or possession, and I think it would be hard for a
17
    particular plaintiff to argue that they don't have control
18
    over access to their medical bills.
19
             So I'm looking at G on Page 17 now, it says:
20
    list all of your medical expenses," blah, blah, blah, blah,
21
    blah, and it doesn't say only if those bills are in your
22
    possession.
23
             I think the defendants are right here, Mr. Nigh, we
24
    negotiated the fact sheets a long time and those fact sheets
```

require plaintiffs to list their medical expenses, so the

```
1
    Court is going to order they have to be provided. Okay?
 2
             With regard to the fact sheet, Defendants, we
 3
    addressed the two general issues you said you had. Are there
 4
    any other issues we need to deal with at the moment on the
 5
    fact sheets?
 6
             MS. LOCKARD: Not at the moment, Your Honor.
                                                           I think
 7
    that should get us a long way along the process.
 8
             THE COURT: The last issue is the Short Form
 9
    Complaint. Let me tell you what my thoughts are about that.
10
             With regard to the defendants who have identified all
11
    defendants, superficially, that's unacceptable. I'm going to
12
    order all of those attorneys to be on the phone or in person
13
    -- no, this next get together is June, the middle of June.
14
    I'm going to order those particular attorneys to be on the
15
    phone to explain why they haven't amended their Short Form
16
    Complaints to particularize the defendants they're suing.
17
             Defendants, are there any other issues regarding the
18
    Short Form Complaints that we need to deal with?
19
             MS. WALEKO: This is Alex Waleko again. No, Your
20
    Honor, it's just these five plaintiffs right now who have
21
    failed to meet the deadline to amend their Complaint, and then
22
    going forward, as additional problematic Short Form Complaints
23
    come in, we have been liaison with plaintiffs' counsel to try
24
    to resolve those informally.
25
             So there may be additional cases in the future, but
```

```
1
    for right now, these are the five that have not been resolved
 2
    by their -- a physical deadline.
 3
             THE COURT: I'm hopeful that between now and the
    middle of June when we next get together, these attorneys will
 4
 5
    file amended Complaints, particularizing the defendants they
    want to sue, but if they don't do it, we'll talk to them and
 6
 7
    get some sort of explanation about what's going on.
 8
             That takes us through Mr. Slater's letter.
 9
             Are there any issues in defendants' letter that we
10
    haven't addressed? Mr. Goldberg?
11
             MR. GOLDBERG: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
12
    just scanning to make sure the agenda is actually the same.
13
             THE COURT: I know we reserved on the pricing
14
    information. Again, I just see that as such an important
15
    issue to the case that's going to require us really to dig
16
    deep into the facts and arguments that I think a separate call
17
    on that issue is warranted.
18
             So we'll do that next week. So this afternoon, I
19
    know the leadership issue is before Judge Kugler. I suppose
20
    we can talk about any other issue you want to raise with Judge
21
    Kugler, but he's on notice to be available for that call at
22
    2 o'clock.
23
             Are there any other issues while we're all together
24
    on this call that we need to address? If you can't think of
25
    any but think of it this afternoon, we can address it this
```

```
1
    afternoon at 2 o'clock.
 2
             MR. SLATER: Your Honor, it's Adam Slater. This is a
 3
    minor detail with the prioritization as we were moving from
 4
    issue to issue. Your Honor ordered with regard to the May 7
    letter from Ms. Hilton. I just wanted for the record just to
 5
 6
    add in what was in the letter to Your Honor that we had
 7
    qualified our request on 8-21 to ensure that we get all of the
    testing results from all chromatograms and it states in the
 9
    letter, but I just wanted to just place on the record and just
10
    ask that that also confirms our understanding that would come
11
    within your order as well.
12
             THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying that,
13
    Mr. Slater. If the May 7 priority letter as clarified and
14
    supplemented by the May 21st letter, right?
15
             MR. SLATER: Yes.
                                Thank you, Your Honor.
16
             THE COURT: Okay.
                               Good. Next item.
17
             Okay. Counsel, I appreciate your time. We'll
18
    reconvene.
19
             Hopefully, is the court reporter, are you available
20
    -- oh, no, Carl is going to do that, I think.
21
                    There being no further issues, thank everyone
22
    for their time. We're adjourned and we'll talk to you in an
23
    hour.
           Thank you.
24
             (1:00 p.m.)
25
```

/	2900 [1] - 1:20	6	Actavis [2] - 3:18 ACTION [1] - 1:4	Alex [6] - 12:18, 40:13, 44:25, 55:22,
/\$ [1] - 75:5	3	6 [2] - 23:17, 70:3	actual [3] - 35:14, 35:16, 35:22	56:23, 72:19 ALEXANDRA [1] -
0	3[1] - 46:14	60 [11] - 50:22, 50:25, 52:4, 52:19, 52:22,	Adam [2] - 5:15, 74:2	3:10
07068 [1] - 1:15	30 [5] - 3:10, 18:6, 28:16, 48:6, 50:21	52:24, 53:16, 55:7, 55:12, 55:20, 56:17	ADAM [1] - 1:14 add [4] - 17:17, 50:19,	ALFANO [1] - 3:12 ALL [1] - 5:1
1	300 [1] - 3:21 30305 [1] - 3:17	60-day [1] - 56:1 600 [2] - 1:17, 3:24	55:16, 74:6 adding [1] - 31:17	allocate [1] - 25:12 allow [2] - 17:25,
10 [2] - 16:5, 16:7	30th [1] - 9:25 316 [1] - 1:17	68 [1] - 71:2	additional [11] - 7:19, 8:19, 19:4, 31:17,	64:10 allows [1] - 16:6
10-3-19 [1] - 71:2 103 [1] - 1:14	31st [9] - 7:16, 8:1,	7	32:7, 50:2, 59:5,	almost [1] - 26:12
109 [1] - 33:21	8:2, 8:7, 8:21, 8:25, 9:13, 10:1, 10:4	7 _[2] - 74:4, 74:13	60:11, 68:22, 72:22, 72:25	alternate [2] - 46:11, 46:19
111 _[1] - 33:21 11:00 _[2] - 1:10, 5:1	32502 [1] - 1:18 3333 [1] - 3:17	701 [1] - 3:3 70130 [1] - 3:4	address [13] - 6:21, 6:22, 7:9, 10:9,	amenable [3] - 7:18, 7:25, 34:15
120 [1] - 52:21 15 [1] - 9:25	34 [3] - 53:7, 53:10, 53:14	756-0160 [1] - 1:24 7th [1] - 61:22	10:17, 17:15, 26:9, 45:7, 45:10, 45:11,	amend [1] - 72:21 amended [2] - 72:15,
150 [1] - 52:21 15219 [1] - 3:14	35 _[1] - 5:5 36 _[2] - 64:1, 64:6		73:24, 73:25	73:5
17 _[2] - 71:5, 71:19	360 [1] - 11:23	8	addressed [2] - 72:3, 73:10	AmerisourceBergen [2] - 3:25, 6:13
17th [1] - 3:10 1835 [1] - 1:20	38 [1] - 63:19 38th [1] - 3:13	8 [5] - 13:6, 13:8, 39:17, 46:10, 56:21	addressing [1] - 12:19 adjourned [1] - 74:22	amount [2] - 44:3, 48:11
19-2875 [1] - 5:4 19103 [2] - 1:21, 3:11	3rd [2] - 59:15, 60:2	8-21 [1] - 74:7 800 [1] - 3:6	advocating [1] - 4 2:25 affect [1] - 5 4:10	analysis [2] - 18:20, 31:22
19422 [1] - 4:3 1:00 [1] - 74:24	4	856 _[1] - 1:24 867 _[1] - 33:3	affected [6] - 37:1, 37:3, 37:25, 38:12,	AND [1] - 1:6 Angeles [1] - 3:21
1:19-md-02875-RBK- JS [1] - 1:5	4 _[1] - 60:16 4/5ths _[1] - 64:15	9	39:25, 57:5	annexed [1] - 18:12
1st _[1] - 8:18	40 [1] - 15:25		afternoon [5] - 6:21, 63:16, 73:18, 73:25,	announce [1] - 5:10 announced [2] - 24:9,
2	40-page [1] - 63:19 42 [1] - 25:11	90 [11] - 18:6, 26:19, 48:7, 48:8, 49:1,	74:1 agenda [3] - 6:18,	24:12 answer [41] - 10:13,
2 [6] - 30:18, 32:10,	439 _[1] - 1:7 440 _[1] - 1:8	49:24, 50:18, 50:22, 51:7, 52:21	6:25, 73:12 aggregate [2] - 34:14,	10:19, 11:6, 11:9, 14:23, 16:23, 17:2,
57:2, 63:16, 73:22, 74:1	45 [11] - 48:8, 48:16, 48:19, 48:20, 48:25,	90-day [2] - 48:8, 48:10	34:20 ago [2] - 47:18, 50:22	18:14, 19:5, 20:6, 20:10, 21:2, 21:21,
20 [2] - 16:6, 16:7 200 [1] - 4:3	49:1, 49:6, 49:7,	90067-2904 [1] - 3:21	agree [10] - 9:12,	25:9, 28:21, 31:9,
200,000 [6] - 28:1,	49:16, 50:23 450 [1] - 4:3	Α	37:12, 40:19, 44:11, 51:15, 52:7, 65:23,	39:21, 40:9, 40:14, 40:16, 40:20, 40:22,
28:5, 28:9, 29:7, 29:10, 29:13	45202 [1] - 3:25 4:00 [1] - 59:16	A-plus [1] - 25:15	66:10, 69:4, 69:14 agreeable [1] - 54:6	40:24, 41:4, 41:6, 42:3, 42:8, 42:17,
2011 [1] - 8:18 2020 [4] - 1:7, 1:9, 5:1,	4:30 [2] - 59:23, 60:2	a.m [2] - 1:10, 5:2 ability [3] - 67:7, 67:13	agreed [23] - 7:5, 8:8, 8:18, 9:7, 12:22,	43:9, 46:23, 48:5, 48:11, 48:19, 48:24,
75:7 2029 [1] - 3:21	5	able [9] - 10:25, 20:11, 21:22, 22:23, 30:13,	13:12, 13:22, 17:23, 18:13, 18:14, 19:17,	49:10, 51:7, 54:1,
2150 [1] - 3:7	5 [9] - 11:22, 12:2,	67:16, 67:17, 70:19 above-entitled [1] -	20:13, 21:21, 22:5,	54:12, 69:3 answered [8] - 37:6,
21st [1] - 74:14 22nd [1] - 61:19	15:8, 15:12, 15:14, 15:25, 16:3, 16:5,	75:3	22:6, 22:17, 35:25, 41:21, 53:22, 61:12,	38:16, 41:22, 46:24, 50:10, 55:4, 55:12,
24 [2] - 16:4, 16:7 249 [1] - 71:2	23:2 54 [27] - 16:3, 16:7,	absent [1] - 8:1 absolute [2] - 20:1,	64:23 agreed-upon [2] - 7:5,	56:17 answers [6] - 11:7,
25 [1] - 50:15 250 [3] - 25:10, 64:2,	16:15, 16:16, 17:3, 17:16, 18:1, 18:12,	21:3 absolutely [3] - 25:16,	61:12 agreement [3] - 8:23,	11:12, 11:14, 16:23, 37:2, 45:25
64:5 2500 [1] - 3:17	25:9, 27:12, 28:3, 28:5, 29:10, 29:14,	66:13, 69:10 abstract [2] - 55:9,	54:2, 54:16 agreements [3] - 62:7,	anticipate [1] - 63:17 anyway [1] - 25:20
25th [1] - 7:16	30:15, 31:23, 39:10, 40:2, 42:13, 42:14,	55:12 accepted [1] - 26:25	62:16, 62:18	API [27] - 10:7, 14:17,
26 _[2] - 1:7, 64:3 27 _[2] - 1:9, 5:1	43:11, 43:12, 44:16,	accepting [1] - 11:17	ahead [3] - 50:11, 68:10, 69:21	14:24, 14:25, 15:2, 17:4, 19:24, 21:9,
2800 [1] - 3:24 28th [2] - 11:22, 23:2	50:1, 50:3, 50:16, 51:19	access [1] - 71:18 accordance [2] - 32:4,	aided [1] - 2:1 aimed [1] - 38:22	26:25, 28:11, 39:23, 39:25, 40:4, 40:6,
29 _[1] - 75:7	55402 [1] - 3:7	63:3 according [1] - 54:19	alert [1] - 64:23	40:10, 40:14, 40:15,

40:19, 41:1, 41:17, 49:1, 49:4, 54:1, 56:25, 57:5, 57:23, 62:7 API's [1] - 37:13 APIs [1] - 13:21 apologies [1] - 59:20 apologize [2] - 31:7, 41:13 appear [1] - 64:2 appearance [2] - 5:9, 5:12 appearances [1] -5:13 apples [2] - 12:3, 12:5 application [1] - 52:20 applied [1] - 28:19 applies [1] - 12:13 apply [1] - 37:1 appreciate [1] - 74:17 approach [1] - 12:15 appropriate [3] -15:15, 60:14, 65:12 appropriately [1] -33.23 approved [4] - 58:1, 63:12, 66:16, 66:18 approving [3] - 49:17, 52:5, 55:3 **Approving** [1] - 71:3 April [2] - 8:12, 61:14 area [1] - 20:23 areas [1] - 20:8 argue [2] - 29:23, 71:17 argued [1] - 32:11 arguing [1] - 33:10 **ARGUMENT**[1] - 1:6 argument [6] - 15:18, 16:14, 17:21, 26:15, 60:18 arguments [2] - 16:12, 73:16 arms [2] - 12:1, 58:24 aside [2] - 35:25, 66:9 assess [1] - 61:11 assessments[1] -69:25 **assumes** [1] - 5:6 assuming [1] - 54:11 assurance [4] - 62:7, 62:8, 62:17, 62:18 Atlanta [1] - 3:17 attach [1] - 52:1 attached [3] - 13:1, 13:10, 49:17 attempt [1] - 18:20 attempts [1] - 44:8 attorneys [3] - 72:12,

72:14, 73:4

Aurobindo [10] - 4:4, 7:4, 7:7, 7:15, 7:16, 7:21, 9:2, 9:4, 9:17, 9.24 **Aurobindo's** [1] - 9:20 Aurolife [1] - 4:4 Aurrobindo [1] - 4:4 authorization [13] -65:4, 65:7, 65:19, 66:12, 66:15, 66:16, 66:22, 66:24, 67:4, 67:5, 67:16, 67:23 authorizations [7] -64:14, 65:3, 65:10, 65:14, 67:15, 68:2, 68:3 available [7] - 23:10, 24:10, 24:11, 27:2, 38:25, 73:21, 74:19 Avenue [1] - 3:6 avoid [1] - 43:18 awarded [1] - 48:11 aware [3] - 9:18, 9:19, 12:9

В

background [2] -

16:13, 51:16

backwards [1] - 70:22 BARNES [1] - 3:20 base[1] - 30:8 based [3] - 20:12, 20:15, 58:5 basic [2] - 36:20, 41:18 basis [4] - 34:3, 34:14, 57:12, 62:15 bat [1] - 20:10 batch [25] - 13:20, 13:24, 14:8, 15:3, 18:21, 18:24, 19:3, 19:5, 19:6, 19:9, 19:16, 20:3, 20:7, 20:11, 20:18, 20:24, 21:4, 21:9, 21:12, 28:15, 30:10, 37:21, 37:22, 38:24, 57:23 batches [4] - 10:25, 20:17, 28:11, 28:17 Bates [3] - 27:19, 31:16, 32:5 Baylen [1] - 1:17 become [2] - 20:19, 39:20 becomes [2] - 20:15, 27:4 beginning [1] - 7:13 behalf [10] - 5:19, 5:25, 6:3, 6:8, 6:10,

6:13, 7:12, 12:18, 12:19, 34:9 **Bell** [1] - 4:3 belong [1] - 35:18 benefit [2] - 5:7, 28:8 Benicar 131 - 50:25. 52:8. 52:10 **Berne**[1] - 6:13 **BERNE** [1] - 3:23 best [4] - 12:14, 25:20, 43:11, 52:23 better [2] - 17:21, 45:6 between [7] - 8:7, 15:11, 24:19, 25:17, 31:21, 50:22, 73:3 beyond [2] - 21:25, 22:19 big [1] - 21:10 bills [3] - 24:18, 71:18, 71:21 blah [8] - 47:7, 71:20, 71:21 blank [4] - 65:4, 66:22, 67:3, 67:16 bless [1] - 24:2 Blue [1] - 4:3 BOSICK[1] - 3:12 bottles [3] - 18:7, 18:9. 52:2 **bottom** [1] - 46:9 brainer [1] - 69:13 **branded** [1] - 51:4

breakdown [1] - 68:14

bring [3] - 52:17, 55:7,

briefing [2] - 19:13,

broad [1] - 38:17

bubble [7] - 32:25,

33:2, 35:3, 46:9,

47:6, 47:8, 57:4

burden [14] - 18:13,

22:20, 25:13, 26:5,

27:4, 27:7, 28:25,

31:18, 32:1, 32:7,

37:10, 42:16, 46:4,

22:14, 28:21, 57:9,

burdensome [4] -

button [2] - 23:20,

BY [10] - 1:14, 1:17,

3:13, 3:16, 3:20,

1:20, 3:2, 3:6, 3:9,

60:18

56:24

65:18

57:13

58:5

3.23

С

CA [1] - 3:21

calculate [1] - 25:6 calculation [1] - 25:3 Camp [1] - 3:3 canceled [1] - 65:18 cancer [1] - 65:15 cannot [1] - 20:6 capability [1] - 67:17 capable [1] - 35:9 capital [2] - 30:18, 31:5 capture [1] - 43:3 care [7] - 43:17, 47:22, 47:23, 58:17, 65:16, 67:8, 67:14 Carl [1] - 74:20 case[31] - 11:3, 11:8, 12:9, 12:10, 15:18, 19:22, 20:21, 22:4, 22:11, 22:21, 25:2, 27:7, 29:1, 31:14, 31:24, 32:3, 32:4, 37:9, 41:19, 58:11, 58:23, 59:9, 68:25, 69:13, 69:16, 69:17, 70:2, 70:5, 70:9, 70:16, 73:15 case-specific [1] -12:9 cases [8] - 25:13, 28:24, 29:4, 46:10, 65:4, 66:4, 70:1, 72:25 categories [1] - 22:2 causes [2] - 46:11, 46:19 caveat [2] - 15:4, 55:6 Centre[1] - 3:13 Century [1] - 3:21 certain [4] - 7:24, 11:1, 44:3, 55:11 certainly [5] - 35:17, 40:23, 41:23, 54:8, 55:10 certainty [1] - 11:15 certify [1] - 75:2 cetera [8] - 14:1, 16:17, 18:10, 19:7, 35:6, 42:19, 56:14 chain [13] - 13:20, 14:3, 14:13, 14:16, 14:24, 15:4, 17:3, 18:1, 18:23, 21:23, 41:18, 50:7, 50:8 chance [2] - 12:21, 59:23 changed [3] - 26:3, 35:12, 50:23

characterization[1] -

characterized [1] -

65:24

65:23 charge [3] - 33:4, 33:8, 33:20 charge-back [2] -33:4, 33:20 chart [2] - 63:23, 70:13 charts [1] - 23:24 chase[1] - 11:5 check[1] - 44:14 chemical [1] - 58:1 choosier [1] - 67:11 chromatograms [1] -74:8 cincinnati [1] - 3:25 **CIPRIANI**[1] - 4:2 circumstances [1] -21:1 cited [1] - 66:16 CIVIL [1] - 1:4 claimed [2] - 68:19, 70:5 claiming [1] - 69:12 clarification [4] - 8:4, 14:6, 41:3, 53:1 clarified [1] - 74:13 clarify [3] - 32:18, 55:24, 55:25 clarifying [1] - 74:12 class [2] - 16:4, 69:11 **classified** [1] - 65:23 clear [3] - 30:9, 38:8, 53:21 clearest[1] - 23:16 clearly [3] - 20:3, 39:5, 39:12 Clem [2] - 6:7, 59:20 **CLEM**[1] - 3:13 client [12] - 8:20, 18:23, 20:4, 21:8, 21:9, 44:18, 45:12, 45:17, 45:18, 45:21, 56:12 client's [1] - 57:19 clients [16] - 9:8. 18:19, 19:24, 20:2, 20:25, 23:20, 23:22, 38:24, 42:6, 42:17, 43:21, 43:22, 43:23, 44:6, 44:8, 44:14 clock[1] - 49:13 close[1] - 10:3 closed [1] - 10:4 CMO[1] - 71:2 Co[1] - 3:22 Cohen [1] - 6:3 **COHEN**[2] - 3:16, 6:2 collect [3] - 8:20, 33:2, 49:23 collected [1] - 8:17

commencement[1] -8:10 Commencing [1] -1:10 comment [5] - 32:25, 33:2, 46:9, 47:5, 57:4 commitment[1] - 8:1 commitments [2] -7:19, 7:23 committee [1] - 10:20 common [1] - 70:6 communicated [1] -46:2 communication [6] -44:6, 44:23, 45:12, 45:17, 45:22, 46:3 communications [7] -43:15, 44:13, 44:19, 45:3, 45:8, 46:6, 51:3 companies [2] - 9:18, 33:8 compile [1] - 68:17 complaint [1] - 64:19 Complaint [2] - 72:9, 72:21 Complaints [4] -72:16, 72:18, 72:22, 73:5 completed [3] - 19:14, 48:13, 49:11 completion [10] -7:15, 7:17, 8:21, 8:25, 10:1, 50:6, 50:7, 53:16, 56:2, 56:3 complicated [6] -20:15, 20:19, 51:1, 51:6, 52:7, 57:22 complied [2] - 64:16, 64:18 comply [1] - 66:18 compromise [9] -11:4, 11:19, 30:16, 31:21, 31:24, 42:22, 48:7, 52:22, 58:9 computation [2] -68:6, 70:4 computer [1] - 2:1 computer-aided [1] conceive[1] - 47:19 concerned [4] - 8:1, 16:10, 29:15, 60:22 concerning [1] - 44:8 concerns [1] - 59:4 concessions [1] -52:16 concluded [1] - 59:24

confer [9] - 7:22, 9:4, 11:8, 59:5, 59:7, 60:10, 61:8, 64:8, 64:21 conference [3] - 9:11, 9:21, 15:19 conferences [1] - 6:6 conferred [1] - 63:24 conferring [2] - 7:13, 34:12 confers [7] - 33:16, 34:1, 34:21, 50:20, 61:3, 61:18, 61:21 confirm [1] - 18:9 confirmation [1] - 9:8 confirms [1] - 74:10 Congress [1] - 29:18 conjunction [1] - 24:6 Conlee [1] - 5:19 CONLEE [1] - 3:2 consensus [1] - 56:8 consideration [1] -60:14 considered [1] - 64:24 consistent [1] - 25:2 constitutes [1] - 37:8 **consumer** [1] - 15:2 consumers [1] - 45:4 consuming [3] -22:17, 50:4, 50:17 contact [3] - 42:7, 42:18, 42:21 contacted [3] - 43:2, 43:12, 46:1 contacts [2] - 42:11, 43:21 contaminated [6] -36:18, 37:5, 37:23, 38:3, 38:14, 38:17 contamination [3] -37:8, 37:11, 58:10 content [1] - 54:10 context [4] - 7:13, 16:9, 17:18, 20:14 continue [1] - 21:18 **CONTINUED** [2] - 3:1, continued [1] - 19:18 contracts [3] - 62:7, 62:16, 62:18 contradictory [1] -65:12 control [3] - 65:13, 71:16, 71:17 conversations [2] -21:7, 65:9 copy[1] - 45:23 core [11] - 7:15, 7:17, 7:25, 8:12, 8:13,

9:20, 24:7, 64:24,

65:24, 66:25, 70:16 correct [19] - 7:12, 16:21, 17:6, 17:11, 40:13, 40:18, 45:1, 48:22, 49:5, 49:18, 51:22, 54:21, 54:25, 56:6, 56:11, 56:21, 58:8, 58:11, 75:2 corrected [1] - 40:1 counsel [22] - 5:7, 5:13, 6:16, 6:17, 7:22, 8:5, 8:14, 9:2, 9:16, 13:3, 14:5, 25:15, 29:21, 41:12, 64:4, 64:11, 64:25, 66:9, 68:1, 68:7, 72:23, 74:17 Counsel [13] - 15:6, 16:11, 18:17, 21:18, 23:12, 56:6, 57:13, 58:7, 58:20, 68:4, 68:9, 68:21, 70:18 couple [3] - 26:12, 63:5 course [6] - 7:1, 7:4, 27:16, 28:17, 32:1, 38:8 COURT [1] - 1:2 Court [12] - 1:23, 27:17, 29:21, 41:12, 49:17, 52:18, 64:4, 64:11, 66:18, 68:7, 70:11, 75:5 Court's [13] - 9:16, 9:24, 10:2, 25:16, 31:19, 32:3, 32:8, 36:1, 36:13, 56:4, 57:1, 63:1, 63:8 Court-approved [1] -66:18 covered [2] - 47:11, 55:23 critical [3] - 16:9, 20:23, 22:14 Cross [2] - 9:15, 47:15 cross [8] - 12:4, 28:13, 33:5, 38:5, 47:1, 59:17, 62:24, 69:20 CRR[1] - 75:5 crystallize [1] - 48:14 cumulative [1] - 14:23 current[2] - 39:19, 68:23 custody [2] - 41:18, 71:15 customer [3] - 13:25, 14:9, 40:25 customers [5] - 20:18, 35:14, 35:16, 35:17,

35:22 cut [2] - 11:4, 47:9 CVS[2] - 3:22, 6:10 D daily [1] - 70:7 damages [3] - 25:3, 25:7, 70:4 Daniel [2] - 5:17, 65:22 **DANIEL** [2] - 1:17, 3:23 data[11] - 14:1, 33:2, 33:3, 33:9, 33:13, 33:14, 33:19, 34:12, 34:18, 34:20 date [32] - 7:5, 7:14, 7:15, 8:1, 8:7, 8:11, 8:18, 8:21, 8:24, 8:25, 10:1, 11:1, 13:25, 14:1, 19:7, 23:18, 24:3, 24:9, 24:12, 32:16, 36:25, 39:17, 49:8, 50:5, 52:4, 55:17, 56:17, 56:18, 59:4, 71:1 Date [1] - 75:7 dates [8] - 7:20, 7:24, 23:25, 24:22, 26:4, 36:5, 41:17, 52:9 Dave [1] - 34:6 DAVIS [1] - 3:16 days [32] - 18:6, 26:19, 48:7, 48:16, 48:19, 48:20, 49:1, 49:2, 49:7, 49:16, 49:25, 50:18, 50:21, 50:22, 50:23, 50:25, 51:7, 52:4, 52:19, 52:21, 52:22, 52:24, 53:16, 55:7, 55:12, 55:20, 56:17 deadline [4] - 9:13, 56:1, 72:21, 73:2 deadlines [2] - 7:17, 9:12 deal [6] - 19:2, 26:20, 60:8, 72:4, 72:18 dealing [2] - 30:17, 31:2 dealt [1] - 42:5 dear[1] - 51:2 decide [1] - 54:18 decided [2] - 15:21, 53:10

decides [1] - 34:19

decision [1] - 66:10

deep[1] - 73:16

decisions [1] - 53:11

Defendant [21] - 3:11, 3:14, 3:22, 3:25, 4:4, 10:7, 14:21, 15:21, 19:19, 20:8, 22:16, 37:13, 39:22, 39:24, 46:23, 48:13, 49:14, 50:7, 50:10, 51:9, 18:[3] - 25:3, 10:4 defendant [30] -

37:13, 39:22, 39:24, 46:23, 48:13, 49:14, 10:13, 12:22, 16:24, 21:25, 24:9, 27:4, 27:16, 27:18, 29:2, 30:14, 32:12, 35:1, 42:8, 42:13, 43:10, 45:10, 45:23, 45:24, 46:1, 46:2, 46:3, 50:8, 53:4, 53:5, 57:21, 61:10, 61:24, 62:21, 62:23, 63:7 defendant's [2] -11:24, 25:24 defendants [109] -5:23, 6:1, 6:3, 6:11, 6:14, 12:19, 12:20, 13:12, 14:4, 14:8, 16:20, 17:2, 20:16, 21:13, 22:15, 23:18, 24:16, 24:20, 24:21, 25:9, 25:17, 25:19, 25:25, 26:24, 27:18, 28:1, 28:4, 28:15, 28:21, 28:23, 29:8, 31:12, 31:25, 32:2, 32:8, 32:16, 34:13, 34:22, 35:15, 35:16, 35:23, 36:9, 36:10, 37:4, 38:7, 39:18, 41:4, 41:16, 42:9, 42:10, 42:14, 42:18, 42:20, 43:2, 43:12, 43:14, 43:21, 44:5, 44:11, 44:15, 44:21, 44:23, 45:15, 46:18, 47:11, 48:4, 48:7, 48:10, 48:15, 49:13, 49:23, 50:13, 50:24, 51:7, 52:13, 53:1, 53:9, 53:20, 54:5, 54:7, 57:11, 59:11, 60:23, 61:1, 61:3, 61:7, 61:16, 63:2, 63:18, 66:7, 66:14, 66:23, 67:12, 67:23, 68:11, 68:14, 68:16, 69:5, 69:6, 69:18, 71:23, 72:10, 72:11, 72:16, 72:17, 73:5 Defendants [5] - 3:18,

42:23, 51:19, 60:24,

Defendants' [1] -

72:2

36:23 defendants' [14] -17:20, 29:12, 29:15, 31:20, 35:8, 36:8, 37:10, 46:21, 49:19, 52:16, 58:13, 67:22, 68:18, 73:9 defense 131 - 11:9. 11:17, 44:20 **Defense** [2] - 3:11, 3:14 defenses [1] - 28:24 defer[1] - 26:9 deficiencies [4] -63:20, 63:23, 64:22, 64:24 deficiency [3] - 60:3, 65:24, 66:25 deficient [1] - 63:23 definitely [1] - 58:18 definitive [1] - 21:2 delete [1] - 37:13 deleted [3] - 32:16, 32:24, 47:3 depositions [1] -59:21 describe [1] - 12:23 **description** [1] - 68:5 designed [2] - 20:9. 43:3 detail [1] - 74:3 detailed [3] - 49:22, 50:14, 65:9 determine [3] - 45:7, 53:18, 62:15 DFS [3] - 12:8, 53:9, 53:12 difference [6] - 24:17, 24:19, 24:22, 24:25, 25:5, 25:17 differences [1] - 24:24 different [9] - 14:15, 26:5, 28:16, 33:10, 48:10, 56:10, 57:16, 61:5, 61:7 difficult [7] - 19:21, 20:21, 21:1, 22:14, 29:3, 49:23, 58:5 dig [2] - 68:17, 73:15 digest[1] - 59:1 direct[1] - 67:11 directed [1] - 14:15 directly [1] - 65:12 disagree [1] - 66:25 discloses [1] - 57:25 disclosures [1] - 70:3 discovery [12] - 7:6, 7:15, 7:17, 7:25, 8:12, 8:13, 9:20, 19:13, 24:8, 53:4,

53:6, 53:10 discuss [2] - 60:17, 63:16 discussed [4] - 9:5. 34:16, 39:13, 70:11 discussion (5) -34:24, 34:25, 53:9, 53:17, 60:4 discussions [1] - 8:10 dispute [19] - 8:3, 12:24, 13:13, 15:14, 15:17, 18:16, 21:20, 21:24, 22:11, 23:4, 26:6, 32:15, 37:15, 41:9, 50:22, 60:20, 61:17, 62:2, 62:20 disputed [4] - 12:25, 26:1, 32:22, 37:9 disputes [1] - 24:15 **DISPUTES**[1] - 1:6 **DISTRICT**[2] - 1:2, 1:2 docket [2] - 70:19, 70:25 **DOCKET**[1] - 1:7 Docket [2] - 5:4, 11:23 doctor [1] - 51:2 document[11] -12:10, 30:9, 33:18, 33:25, 45:2, 45:18, 47:10, 47:12, 47:17, 56:10, 57:20 documentation [1] -70:8 documents [48] - 7:7, 7:19, 8:19, 8:24, 9:9, 10:14, 10:15, 11:12, 22:3, 22:20, 22:24, 23:10, 23:23, 23:24, 27:8, 27:17, 28:2, 28:5, 28:12, 29:1, 29:8, 29:10, 29:13, 29:14, 30:7, 31:16, 32:2, 32:6, 36:8, 45:6, 47:19, 50:2, 56:14, 58:21, 60:22, 61:5, 61:6, 61:16, 62:8, 62:9, 62:11, 69:8, 71:15 Documents [1] - 47:6 dog [2] - 30:25, 31:8 done [9] - 10:21, 10:25, 29:9, 31:13, 31:23, 51:24, 51:25, 61:23, 70:21 dose [20] - 14:17, 17:4, 19:24, 26:11, 37:14, 39:25, 40:5, 40:7, 40:9, 40:12,

40:15, 40:16, 40:21,

41:1, 48:25, 49:4, 53:25, 56:1, 62:8 down [8] - 5:11, 13:20, 21:8, 43:14, 45:23, 57:4, 64:10, 64:13 downstream [3] -53:4. 54:6. 54:19 draft [2] - 47:20, 53:20 driving [1] - 64:25 drug [6] - 14:14, 28:18, 37:3, 39:18, 51:4, 57:24 drugs [13] - 10:24, 36:16, 36:19, 37:1, 37:4, 38:13, 38:15, 38:19, 39:10, 39:25, 40:5, 45:17 **DUANE**[1] - 3:9 Duane [2] - 5:25, 12:18 duplicate [1] - 12:7 duplicative [2] -36:22, 37:19 during [1] - 11:8

Ε

e-mail [1] - 45:11 e.g [1] - 35:14 early [1] - 38:1 easier [7] - 19:1, 30:8, 39:4, 42:13, 61:6, 62:16, 62:17 easiest [2] - 26:7, 42:6 easily [2] - 23:21, 70:19 East[1] - 3:21 easy [4] - 36:11, 41:21, 41:23, 63:1 **ECF**[1] - 71:2 economic [1] - 16:4 edited [1] - 35:15 effectively[1] - 27:21 efficiency [1] - 25:4 efficient [4] - 11:15, 12:21, 25:12, 30:12 efforts [2] - 63:3, 63:9 Eisenhower [1] - 1:14 electronic [3] - 33:3, 33:7, 33:14 elementary [1] - 70:1 eliminated [1] - 64:21 end [4] - 47:10, 50:9, 53:7, 54:20 ended [2] - 13:21, 21:15 ends [2] - 21:12, 40:11 energy [1] - 51:6 engage [1] - 18:14

enter [1] - 5:13 entered [3] - 11:22, 55:11, 71:1 enters [1] - 55:3 entire [1] - 11:7 entirely [2] - 23:7, 68:15 entities [1] - 5:25 entitled [4] - 39:9, 44:7, 70:17, 75:3 entity [2] - 35:6, 35:13 entries [2] - 5:9, 5:12 entry [1] - 56:4 Entry [1] - 70:3 envision [2] - 48:21, 62:13 envisioned [2] -48:18, 71:13 equally [3] - 22:23, 27:2, 35:9 **equipped** [1] - 45:6 especially [4] - 22:22, 29:3, 31:11, 48:14 ESQUIRE [13] - 1:14, 1:17, 1:20, 3:2, 3:3, 3:6, 3:9, 3:10, 3:13, 3:16, 3:16, 3:20, 4:2 essential [1] - 70:15 31:25

established [1] et [8] - 14:1, 16:17, 18:10, 19:7, 35:6, 42:19, 56:14 event[1] - 49:10 eventually [1] - 17:4 evidence [1] - 70:8 exact[3] - 39:10, 49:8, 52:9 exactly [5] - 9:5, 11:6, 12:24, 55:9, 67:19 example [10] - 22:5, 24:1, 24:2, 25:18, 26:7, 27:1, 28:8, 28:10, 62:6, 62:10 excellent [1] - 28:8 except[1] - 26:12 excess [1] - 5:5 executive [2] - 10:20, 29:20 exercise [5] - 18:2, 18:8, 18:13, 50:2, 63:2 exhibit [1] - 32:23 Exhibit [21] - 13:10, 13:14, 25:23, 26:8, 26:11, 26:18, 26:23, 30:19, 30:24, 31:6, 41:25, 46:12, 46:13, 47:22, 47:24, 48:3, 56:25, 57:1, 57:2,

58:17 exist[1] - 38:24 existing [1] - 39:11 exists [1] - 64:17 expect[1] - 63:14 expected [1] - 31:18 expended [1] - 63:9 expenses [12] - 24:16, 24:19, 24:21, 25:1, 68:15, 68:19, 68:24, 69:3, 69:12, 71:20, 71:25 expert [2] - 46:21, 46:24 expiration [2] - 14:1, 19:6 explain [4] - 12:22, 13:11, 17:20, 72:15 explanation [1] - 73:7 explicit[1] - 71:6 **expressed**[1] - 61:10 extension [1] - 52:20 extensive [1] - 47:18 extent [5] - 12:5, 21:22, 34:13, 35:23, 44:5 extra [3] - 18:1, 26:12, 39:20

F

face [1] - 63:11 facilitate [1] - 14:2 Fact [34] - 10:7, 14:20, 14:21, 15:21, 19:11, 19:19, 20:8, 22:16, 36:23, 37:13, 39:22, 39:24, 43:1, 43:5, 43:7, 46:23, 48:13, 49:11, 49:12, 49:14, 50:6, 50:7, 50:10, 50:11, 52:1, 56:5, 57:10, 63:18, 64:16, 65:6, 67:18, 70:12, 71:3, 71:13 fact [60] - 10:13, 12:2, 13:18, 14:15, 14:23, 15:12, 15:14, 15:15, 18:14, 20:9, 22:12, 23:6, 28:22, 33:18, 34:23, 35:18, 40:1, 44:14, 45:25, 47:11, 47:20, 48:4, 48:5, 49:17, 50:25, 51:1, 51:5, 52:5, 52:6, 52:12, 53:16, 53:19, 53:23, 54:7, 54:10, 54:14, 54:21, 55:2, 55:10, 55:14, 55:18, 56:4, 56:9, 56:16,

ensure[1] - 74:7

56:24, 56:25, 58:19, 60:22, 66:16, 66:19, 67:25, 70:20, 70:21, 70:23, 70:25, 71:24, 72:2, 72:5 facts [1] - 73:16 failed [1] - 72:21 fair [4] - 8:22, 31:24, 42:22, 52:22 faith [6] - 19:18, 34:15, 42:17, 61:16, 63:2, 63:8 familiar [1] - 23:3 favor [1] - 67:22 FDA [2] - 24:7, 35:5 **FDA's** [1] - 24:11 federal [1] - 70:10 feet [1] - 9:21 fell [1] - 35:7 few [2] - 30:21, 33:11 fields [2] - 33:13, 33:20 fifth [1] - 64:19 figure [1] - 11:1 file [3] - 57:25, 66:4, 73:5 filed [1] - 71:2 filing [1] - 25:24 filings [1] - 13:1 fill [4] - 67:3, 67:8, 67:16 final [1] - 9:13 finalize [2] - 52:12, 54:20 finalized [8] - 24:5, 24:6, 33:22, 45:2, 47:13, 53:23, 54:22, 55:2 finalizing [1] - 56:5 fine [4] - 5:6, 5:10, 13:3, 32:20 fingers [1] - 70:24 finished [21] - 14:17, 17:4, 19:24, 26:11, 37:14. 39:25. 40:5. 40:7, 40:9, 40:12, 40:15, 40:16, 40:20, 40:21, 41:1, 48:25, 49:4, 53:25, 56:1, 58:18, 62:8 fire [1] - 9:21 firms [4] - 67:10, 67:12, 68:24, 69:1 first [31] - 7:3, 13:11, 14:9, 15:23, 16:22, 16:23, 19:1, 24:6, 24:12, 24:25, 26:9, 26:17, 26:18, 26:24, 30:17, 33:1, 41:22, 44:13, 46:4, 49:3,

49:10, 49:13, 50:5, 51:11, 51:20, 53:24, 63:22, 64:14, 65:3, 66:11 fits [1] - 11:21 five [3] - 47:10, 72:20, 73:1 Floor [1] - 3:13 floor [1] - 17:19 Florida [1] - 1:18 flow[1] - 61:13 focusing [1] - 28:23 followed [2] - 48:25, 49.1 food [1] - 18:23 FOR [1] - 1:2 forego [1] - 23:6 foregoing [1] - 75:2 foreign [2] - 62:9, 62:10 foremost[1] - 65:3 forest[1] - 11:7 Form [4] - 72:8, 72:15, 72:18, 72:22 form [3] - 43:22, 44:19, 53:20 formerly [1] - 33:20 forms [1] - 44:1 forth [1] - 7:20 forward [2] - 11:11, 72:22 four [3] - 14:15, 47:10 fourth [1] - 57:4 frames [1] - 10:22 framing [1] - 21:20 frankly [3] - 51:8, 60:20, 66:3 free [2] - 7:2, 60:12 FREEMAN[1] - 1:13 Friday [2] - 7:22, 61:2 Friedlander [2] - 1:23, 75:5 friedlanderreporter @gmail.com [1] -1.24 front [6] - 26:8, 52:9, 61:20, 67:25, 70:24, 71:4 frontline [1] - 33:25 fully [1] - 27:23 fulsome [2] - 47:12, 47:18

G

future [1] - 72:25

gathered [1] - 41:23 general [7] - 34:17, 52:14, 54:2, 54:16, 58:22, 61:25, 72:3 generally [1] - 54:5 generic [2] - 14:13, 66:16 GEOPPINGER [4] -3:23, 6:12, 54:4, 55:5 Geoppinger [3] - 6:13, 54:4, 55:5 Georgia [1] - 3:17 given [6] - 25:13, 31:24, 56:17, 58:4, 61:5, 65:4 global [3] - 10:19, 34:3, 34:12 globally [2] - 10:11, 10:12 goal [2] - 13:18, 14:2 Goldberg [4] - 5:25, 60:25, 61:19, 73:10 GOLDBERG [9] - 3:9, 5:24, 59:11, 60:1, 60:25, 62:1, 62:4, 62:13, 73:11 GOLDENBERG [31] -3:5, 3:6, 30:2, 30:23, 31:3, 31:9, 32:19, 34:5, 37:17, 38:22, 39:4, 39:7, 39:15, 40:11, 40:23, 41:6, 41:10, 41:13, 42:24, 43:6, 43:16, 45:9, 48:3, 48:6, 48:22, 49:5, 49:9, 49:18, 51:22, 51:25, 58:12 Goldenberg [10] -29:19. 29:23. 30:3. 30:18, 32:17, 34:5, 39:13. 40:18. 41:14. 48:18 **GOLOMB**[1] - 1:19 **GORDON** [1] - 3:12 granted [2] - 52:16, 68:18 granular [1] - 49:22 great [4] - 28:20, 39:14, 43:8, 58:20 GREENBERG [1] -3:15 Greenberg [2] - 6:3, 63:22 ground [1] - 11:24 group [6] - 25:9, 41:4, 41:5, 41:6, 48:20, 48:21 Group [2] - 3:11, 3:14 quess [3] - 30:10. 34:16, 69:15

Н half [1] - 37:3 hand [2] - 29:25, 52:9 handful[1] - 43:13 handing [1] - 29:22 handle [1] - 33:8 handled [4] - 33:16, 33:23, 34:1 **hands** [1] - 21:15 handy [1] - 70:24 happy [1] - 39:15 hard [5] - 24:4, 43:11, 47:18, 56:16, 71:16 hard-pressed [1] -56:16 head [1] - 30:4 header [1] - 47:6 health [3] - 67:2, 67:8, 67:14 Health [1] - 3:22 hear [10] - 9:10, 26:14, 26:15, 27:9, 29:17, 49:19, 51:13, 68:8, 69:18, 70:14 heard [2] - 9:14, 15:20 hearing [1] - 34:17 heavily [1] - 65:8 HEINZ[3] - 4:2, 9:3, 10:6 Heinz [1] - 9:4 help [8] - 10:11, 11:2, 11:4, 11:9, 16:13, 51:17, 64:13, 65:2 helping [1] - 38:22 helps [1] - 13:10 Hetero [11] - 7:4, 7:14, 7:16, 7:18, 8:6, 8:9, 8:11, 8:14, 8:23, 9:7 high [1] - 28:10 **HILTON** [5] - 3:3, 7:11, 8:9, 9:1, 34:9 Hilton [8] - 7:9, 7:11, 9:5, 34:6, 34:9, 61:20, 61:24, 74:5 Hilton's [3] - 61:22, 62:5, 63:4

9.5, 34.6, 34.9, 61:20, 61:24, 74:5 Hilton's [3] - 61:22, 62:5, 63:4 historically [1] - 24:11 hit [2] - 30:4, 70:8 hold [4] - 9:20, 16:11, 58:7 holding [1] - 48:8 holdup [1] - 10:22 hole [1] - 20:20 honestly [1] - 20:19 HONIK [3] - 1:19, 1:20, 5:21 Honik [1] - 5:21 Honor [88] - 5:15, 5:17, 5:21, 5:24, 6:2,

6:7, 6:9, 6:12, 7:10, 7:11, 8:9, 9:1, 9:3, 10:6, 10:18, 10:22, 12:8, 12:17, 15:13, 17:1, 17:22, 21:7, 22:13, 24:5, 24:23, 25:22, 26:10, 27:22, 28:7, 29:22, 30:2, 30:24, 31:7, 31:10, 33:1, 34:9, 35:2, 35:10, 36:4, 36:12, 36:21, 37:17, 38:11, 38:22, 39:15, 39:16, 41:10, 42:1, 42:24, 43:3, 43:16, 44:25, 46:8, 47:23, 48:3, 48:9, 49:21, 51:13, 52:25, 53:3, 54:3, 54:4, 54:24, 55:5, 55:6, 55:22, 56:11, 56:23, 58:12, 58:19, 59:12, 59:20, 60:25, 62:2, 63:21, 64:15, 65:8, 65:22, 68:22, 71:3, 71:7, 72:6, 72:20, 73:11, 74:2, 74:4, 74:6, 74:15 Honor's [2] - 23:1, 53:15 HONORABLE [1] -1:11 hope [1] - 11:4 hopeful [2] - 9:11, 73:3 hopefully [3] - 17:16, 61:11, 74:19 hoping [2] - 9:10, 11:19 hour [1] - 74:23 hundred [2] - 18:7. 69:11

1

hurry [1] - 34:7

65:16

29:7

hypertension[1] -

hypothetically [1] -

ID [6] - 11:3, 16:18, 17:13, 23:9, 50:2, 51:20 idea [5] - 13:4, 14:14, 14:19, 14:25, 15:3 ideally [1] - 43:19 identical [1] - 26:12 identification [14] -13:15, 13:23, 15:22, 17:24, 18:8, 20:20, 21:21, 21:25, 22:7, 22:13, 22:19, 22:22,

guide [1] - 21:10

information [90] -

10:15, 11:1, 12:12,

13:11, 13:16, 13:23,

27:3, 37:6 identified [6] - 15:8, 15:25, 35:5, 38:13, 64:20, 72:10 identify [29] - 14:3, 14:7, 14:8, 14:10, 20:11. 22:2. 22:6. 22:10. 22:21. 26:24. 27:19, 28:5, 31:16, 32:5, 33:2, 36:16, 36:17, 37:4, 37:10, 38:12, 42:9, 42:14, 46:5, 46:19, 50:2, 57:5, 57:22, 58:15, 60:21 identifying [2] - 35:9, 58:2 **II** [4] - 30:18, 30:24, 31:5, 32:10 II(B[1] - 35:5 III.B.7[1] - 42:25 *illustration* [1] - 28:20 important [9] - 11:3, 18:2, 37:23, 37:25, 49:25, 55:25, 58:23, 59:9, 73:14 impossible [2] -19:21, 21:13 impression [1] - 23:21 IN [2] - 1:4, 1:6 inaccurate [1] - 11:14 Inc [3] - 3:18, 3:19, 4:4 inclined [2] - 25:25, 36:9 include [3] - 26:1, 66:23, 66:24 included [3] - 34:23, 36:7, 47:19 including [1] - 23:8 incomplete [2] -11:13, 67:6 incredibly [2] - 29:3, 50:17 independently [1] -15:1 individual [11] - 13:19, 25:6, 31:14, 60:5, 61:3, 61:18, 61:21, 62:15, 66:15, 68:1, 69:23 individual/plaintiffs [1] - 15:7 individualized [1] -61:4 individuals [2] - 42:9, 65:11 indulgence [1] - 70:18 Industries [1] - 3:18 industry [1] - 19:15 informally [1] - 72:24

13:24, 14:11, 14:20, 14:23, 15:3, 15:22, 16:19, 17:8, 17:13, 17:16, 17:24, 18:21, 19:4, 19:10, 19:17, 19:25, 20:1, 20:4, 20:12, 20:19, 20:24, 21:12, 21:16, 21:22, 22:7, 22:8, 22:23, 23:7, 23:8, 24:8, 24:10, 25:7, 27:1, 27:3, 27:12, 30:15, 33:17, 33:23, 34:2, 35:8, 36:20, 37:6, 37:18, 39:21, 41:16, 41:18, 41:20, 42:10, 42:15, 42:21, 43:20, 44:7, 49:22, 50:14, 51:10, 51:12, 51:21, 52:14, 52:24, 56:22, 57:18, 59:1, 59:6, 59:14, 60:9, 60:11, 61:13, 62:19, 62:22, 67:1, 67:3, 68:12, 68:13, 68:16, 69:25, 70:15, 70:16, 71:8, 71:9, 71:11, 71:12, 73:14 initial [4] - 14:10, 17:15, 64:3, 70:3 injury [6] - 16:6, 46:10, 64:2, 64:5, 69:24, 70:2 inquiry [1] - 32:9 instance [8] - 14:9. 15:23, 16:22, 44:13, 46:4, 51:11, 51:20, 53:24 instances [1] - 45:10 intend [2] - 34:14, 61:9 interchange [2] - 33:3, 33:14 interested [2] - 22:25, 60:7 interrogatory [1] -31:15 interrupt [1] - 68:8 interrupted [1] - 21:17 invited [2] - 61:2, 61:8 involved [1] - 60:4 issue [82] - 7:4, 7:6, 7:21, 10:5, 10:8, 10:12, 11:25, 12:2, 12:16, 12:19, 12:21, 13:6, 13:7, 15:20, 19:12, 22:14, 22:15,

23:4, 23:15, 23:17, 24:19, 25:21, 26:20, 26:21, 26:22, 27:24, 29:25, 30:17, 30:20, 31:1, 31:19, 32:9, 32:12, 32:22, 33:15, 34:24, 35:1, 37:9, 37:24, 41:15, 42:1, 42:22, 45:20, 46:7, 46:9, 47:4, 47:5, 51:4, 53:13, 55:21, 56:20, 57:18, 58:16, 58:23, 58:24, 59:3, 59:4, 59:8, 59:14, 60:2, 60:3, 60:13, 60:19, 61:5, 63:4, 63:15, 66:11, 66:12, 67:21, 68:2, 68:4, 68:5, 68:23, 72:8, 73:15, 73:17, 73:19, 73:20, 74:4 Issue[1] - 60:16 issued [1] - 15:16 issues [30] - 6:20, 6:22, 7:1, 11:3, 11:20, 13:2, 19:22, 25:24, 26:2, 34:17, 39:19, 41:25, 48:14, 53:6, 53:10, 53:14, 54:18, 54:23, 60:6, 60:16, 64:9, 64:12, 65:2, 66:9, 72:3, 72:4, 72:17, 73:9, 73:23, 74:21 item [2] - 70:4, 74:16 itemize [2] - 30:4, 69:4

J

January [6] - 8:18, 11:22, 15:16, 15:18, 23:2, 23:4 **Jeff** [3] - 6:12, 54:4, 55:5 **JEFFREY**[1] - 3:23 JERSEY [1] - 1:2 Jersey [2] - 1:15, 21:15 **JESSICA** [1] - 4:2 Jessica [1] - 9:3 iob [1] - 30:8 JOEL [1] - 1:11 Johnston [5] - 6:10, 52:25, 54:6, 54:24, 55:16 JOHNSTON [6] - 3:20, 6:9, 52:25, 53:3, 54:3, 54:24 Joint [2] - 3:11, 3:14 JUDGE [1] - 1:11

Judge [6] - 6:19, 29:18, 47:16, 62:25, 73:19, 73:20 July [13] - 7:16, 8:1, 8:2, 8:7, 8:21, 8:25, 9:13, 9:25, 10:1, 10:4. 65:9. 65:13. 70:11 jump [1] - 30:10 June [10] - 7:16, 9:25, 53:7, 54:20, 59:15, 60:2, 64:3, 72:13, 73:4

Κ

KANNER [1] - 3:2 Karen [2] - 1:23, 75:5 KATZ[1] - 1:13 **keep**[2] - 61:14, 64:15 kept [4] - 57:20, 58:6, 62:19, 62:22 key [2] - 64:9, 65:2 kind [6] - 12:23, 13:2, 25:11, 27:4, 30:3, 43:25 knowing [1] - 36:1 knowledge [2] -31:12, 37:22 knows [3] - 36:20, 38:15, 53:3 Kugler [3] - 6:19, 73:19, 73:21

labels [1] - 52:2 language [4] - 35:11, 39:25, 43:3, 68:1 large [1] - 64:17 Lasalle [1] - 3:6 last [4] - 53:11, 65:9, 70:11, 72:8 Laughter [1] - 39:3 law [6] - 32:4, 67:10, 67:12, 68:24, 69:1, 71:14 LAW[1] - 3:5 Layne [4] - 7:11, 9:5, 34:6, 34:9 LAYNE[1] - 3:3 leadership [5] - 5:6, 5:13, 6:16, 63:15, 73:19 least [13] - 8:22, 9:17, 11:6, 11:11, 17:12,

17:15, 21:13, 25:18,

53:20, 54:22, 57:19,

legal [2] - 24:24, 44:2

61:13, 71:14

L

length [1] - 53:18 less [2] - 50:16, 51:1 letter [26] - 6:24, 7:3, 7:20, 10:11, 11:24, 13:7, 23:15, 23:16, 38:20. 44:19. 56:21. 58:8. 58:16. 61:2. 61:15, 61:19, 61:22, 62:6, 63:4, 73:8, 73:9, 74:5, 74:6, 74:9, 74:13, 74:14 **LETTERS**[1] - 1:7 letters [6] - 6:17, 6:20, 6:23, 43:23, 51:2 level [4] - 12:9, 21:8, 48:16, 50:7 levels [2] - 14:15, 26:23 **LEVIN**[1] - 1:16 liability [2] - 11:3, 68:25 **LIABILITY** [1] - 1:5 liaison [1] - 72:23 likely [1] - 50:9 limit [1] - 27:18 Limited [1] - 9:4 limited [6] - 22:12, 31:22, 35:22, 39:10, 65:14, 67:15 line [1] - 8:17 link[1] - 12:9 list [15] - 24:16, 24:20, 24:21, 58:9, 63:20, 64:3, 64:14, 64:24, 64:25, 68:15, 68:17, 69:12, 70:4, 71:20, 71:25 listed [3] - 65:24, 66:8, 67:18 listing [1] - 71:6 **LITIGATION** [1] - 1:5 litigation [5] - 5:4, 9:19, 31:18, 38:8, 70:7 live [1] - 38:4 LLC[4] - 1:13, 3:2, 3:18, 4:4 LLP [5] - 3:9, 3:12,

3:15, 3:20, 3:23

location [1] - 39:19

LOCKARD [9] - 3:16,

63:21, 64:5, 64:12,

68:5, 68:10, 69:22,

look[12] - 11:5, 12:15,

29:13, 36:8, 45:6,

56:14, 62:5, 70:20,

22:20, 23:23, 25:23,

71:5, 72:6

Lockard [4] - 6:4,

63:21, 69:22

United States District Court Camden, New Jersey

70:25 looked [1] - 34:10 looking [12] - 17:7, 20:1, 30:5, 37:21, 42:5, 46:14, 46:16, 48:9, 48:12, 50:13, 54:7. 71:19 looks [2] - 32:23, 55:19 loop [1] - 10:4 LORI [1] - 3:16 Lori [1] - 6:2 Los [1] - 3:21 loss [1] - 16:5 Louisiana [1] - 3:4 Ltd [2] - 3:18, 4:4 lumped [1] - 32:24

M

macro [6] - 19:13, 53:6, 53:10, 54:18, 54:22, 60:16 MAGISTRATE [1] -1:11 mail [1] - 45:11 main [3] - 10:22, 13:18, 19:8 maintain [3] - 22:12, 35:15, 61:5 majority [1] - 64:18 management[1] -15:19 manner[1] - 34:15 manufacture [3] -11:2, 13:25, 32:16 manufactured [3] -14:4, 19:6, 28:10 manufacturer [15] -12:20, 12:22, 13:12, 22:1, 26:11, 40:15, 40:24, 41:2, 43:22, 43:24, 44:4, 53:5, 57:15, 57:21 Manufacturer [3] -19:19, 39:24, 56:5 manufacturers [40] -13:22, 14:18, 14:25, 15:1, 16:9, 17:4, 17:5, 17:8, 17:14, 17:23, 18:13, 19:2, 19:9, 19:10, 19:17, 19:24, 20:11, 22:5, 22:6, 22:9, 22:12, 22:15, 22:16, 23:6, 23:11, 33:19, 40:4, 40:6, 40:7, 45:3, 47:13, 48:25, 49:1, 49:4, 53:25, 54:1, 56:1, 56:2, 57:11

manufactures [1] -20:16 manufacturing [3] -40:21, 62:7, 62:8 Manufacturing [1] -10:7 March [1] - 53:12 Market [1] - 1:20 market [2] - 14:14, 21:11 Marlene [4] - 30:2, 31:4, 34:5, 41:13 MARLENE [1] - 3:6 master[1] - 57:24 matches [1] - 54:14 matter[1] - 75:3 MAY[1] - 1:7 MAZIE [1] - 1:13 MDL [1] - 5:4 mean [11] - 20:14, 21:13, 27:18, 36:19, 38:15, 39:5, 39:11, 40:2, 45:9, 68:20, 71:10 meaning [1] - 37:1 means [1] - 37:11 meaty [2] - 6:17, 10:8 **mechanical** [1] - 1:25 medical [16] - 16:5, 24:16, 24:18, 24:20, 25:1, 67:23, 68:5, 68:15, 68:19, 68:23, 68:24, 69:3, 69:12, 71:18, 71:20, 71:25 medications [1] -10:24 meet [17] - 7:22, 9:4, 11:8, 33:16, 34:1, 34:21, 50:20, 59:5, 59:7, 60:10, 61:3, 61:8, 61:18, 61:21, 64:8, 64:21, 72:21 meeting [2] - 7:13, 34:11 members [1] - 10:20 mention [3] - 16:8, 50:24, 55:8 mentioned [6] - 13:17, 15:9, 17:23, 21:20, 22:13, 65:17 merge [2] - 37:18, 38:4 met[1] - 63:24 mid [1] - 61:14 mid-April [1] - 61:14 middle [3] - 11:24, 72:13, 73:4 might [16] - 6:20,

15:17, 26:3, 26:4,

28:10, 28:16, 32:14,

38:25, 40:25, 44:2, 45:11, 45:12, 55:23, 60:6, 62:16, 62:17 millions [2] - 12:11, 23:23 mind [2] - 61:14, 64:15 minimal [1] - 65:18 minimum [3] - 20:1, 20:24, 21:3 Minneapolis [2] - 3:7, 59:22 Minnesota [1] - 3:7 minor [1] - 74:3 minus [1] - 15:25 minutes [2] - 30:22, 33:11 Miss[1] - 6:4 missing [1] - 55:4 model [1] - 11:10 moment [3] - 54:8, 72:4, 72:6 money [1] - 44:3 monitoring [1] - 16:5 month [1] - 64:6 months [8] - 9:19, 48:12, 52:23, 56:15, 56:18 morning [11] - 5:15, 5:17, 5:21, 5:24, 6:2, 6:7, 6:9, 6:12, 7:11, 9:3, 30:3 morning's [1] - 6:18 MORRIS [1] - 3:9 Morris [2] - 5:25, 12:18 most[8] - 12:20, 18:3, 25:12, 37:10, 50:9, 51:12, 51:23, 60:22 move[2] - 11:15, 30:12 moving [1] - 74:3 MR [34] - 5:15, 5:17, 5:21, 5:24, 6:7, 6:12, 7:9, 10:18, 12:5, 29:18, 29:22, 31:4, 31:7, 54:4, 55:5, 59:11, 59:18, 59:20, 60:1, 60:25, 62:1, 62:4, 62:13, 65:22, 66:6, 66:13, 66:20, 68:22, 69:14, 71:2, 71:7, 73:11, 74:2, 74:15 MS [111] - 5:19, 6:2, 6:9, 7:11, 8:9, 9:1, 9:3, 10:6, 12:17, 13:8, 14:12, 15:10, 15:13, 16:2, 16:21,

17:17, 17:22, 18:18, 18:25, 20:6, 21:7, 21:19, 23:13, 24:5, 24:23, 25:22, 26:10, 26:17, 26:22, 27:14, 27:22, 28:7, 28:14, 29:16, 30:2, 30:23, 31:3, 31:9, 32:13, 32:19, 32:21, 33:6, 34:5, 34:9, 35:2, 35:21, 36:3, 36:12, 36:21, 37:17, 38:11, 38:22, 39:4, 39:7, 39:15, 39:16, 40:4, 40:11, 40:18, 40:23, 41:6, 41:10, 41:13, 42:1, 42:24, 43:6, 43:16, 44:25, 45:9, 46:8. 46:13. 46:18. 46:22, 47:5, 47:8, 47:23, 48:3, 48:6, 48:22, 49:5, 49:9, 49:18, 49:21, 51:13, 51:22, 51:25, 52:25, 53:3, 54:3, 54:24, 55:22, 56:7, 56:11, 56:23, 57:4, 57:8, 57:14, 58:12, 58:18, 63:21, 64:5, 64:12, 68:5, 68:10, 69:22, 71:5, 72:6, 72:19 multiple [6] - 20:17, 27:5, 50:3, 57:16, 71:7 must [2] - 20:1, 20:2 mute [1] - 51:17 Mylan [3] - 3:14, 6:8, 59:21

Ν

nail [1] - 30:4 name [3] - 5:8, 5:10, 45:7 names [3] - 42:19, 57:25, 58:1 narrow [2] - 64:10, 64:13 nature [2] - 25:13, 52:14 NE [1] - 3:17 necessarily [1] - 71:10 necessary [3] - 23:9, 50:18, 51:8 need [16] - 18:21, 20:24, 34:3, 35:11, 38:9, 44:12, 59:1, 60:4, 61:18, 61:25, 69:25, 70:8, 70:16, 72:4, 72:18, 73:24 needs [4] - 40:1,

55:11, 62:22, 65:6 negotiate [1] - 34:14 negotiated [3] - 65:8, 70:13, 71:24 negotiating [1] - 53:6 negotiation [1] - 19:12 negotiations [2] -19:18, 33:24 never [4] - 44:22, 45:17, 45:18, 71:13 NEW [1] - 1:2 New [3] - 1:15, 3:4, 21:15 next [31] - 10:5, 14:22, 26:22, 32:12, 32:13, 32:22, 35:1, 35:2, 36:5, 36:16, 38:19, 42:1, 46:7, 46:8, 47:4, 47:5, 48:20, 48:21, 55:21, 56:20, 59:4, 59:15, 60:9, 60:11, 63:15, 64:6, 72:13, 73:4, 73:18, 74:16 **NIGH** [9] - 1:17, 5:17, 65:22, 66:6, 66:13, 66:20, 68:22, 69:14, 71:7 Nigh [6] - 5:17, 65:22, 66:5, 67:20, 71:14, 71:23 nine [1] - 48:12 nitrosamine [1] -26:25 no-brainer [1] - 69:13 nobody [2] - 11:14, 66:8 noise [1] - 51:16 none [1] - 63:25 normal [2] - 27:16, 32:1 normally [1] - 31:18 NOS [1] - 1:7 note [3] - 37:12, 39:23, 64:14 nothing [1] - 67:5 notice [3] - 36:25, 52:13, 73:21 notices [8] - 23:19, 23:24, 24:2, 24:4, 24:6, 24:22, 26:4, 36:6 notion [1] - 62:20 number [25] - 13:24, 14:8, 18:22, 19:3, 19:5, 19:9, 19:16,

20:3, 20:8, 20:12,

20:24, 21:4, 28:1,

30:5, 30:8, 31:16,

31:22, 31:23, 46:15,

16:25, 17:6, 17:11,

65:15, 65:25, 66:1, 66:2, 66:4 **NUMBER**[1] - 1:4 **numbers**[2] - 27:19, 32:5 **Numeral**[3] - 30:18, 31:5, 32:10

0

o'clock [3] - 6:19, 73:22, 74:1 oath [2] - 43:10, 43:13 object [2] - 22:11, 57:11 objected [1] - 57:12 objection [19] - 7:5, 31:20, 32:10, 34:22, 35:10, 36:2, 36:12, 36:14, 36:15, 38:18, 42:23, 47:2, 47:16, 47:21, 58:13, 59:10, 59:11, 59:25, 61:23 obligation [1] - 25:2 obtain [2] - 41:22, 41:23 obviously [6] - 10:8, 14:25, 25:5, 50:17, 54:10, 55:7 occasions [1] - 71:8 occurred [1] - 44:15 **OF**[1] - 1:2 offered [2] - 48:7, 58:9 offers [1] - 44:1 office [1] - 70:23 Official [1] - 1:23 oftentimes [1] - 69:1 OH [1] - 3:25 **ON**[1] - 1:6 once [5] - 22:7, 22:22, 27:2, 32:19, 55:10 One [1] - 3:13 one [40] - 7:10, 11:10, 11:20, 12:17, 13:17, 14:16, 14:17, 14:18, 16:8, 18:1, 19:21, 24:14, 24:24, 25:8, 25:18, 26:14, 28:21, 32:15, 34:6, 35:13, 35:23, 37:14, 39:20, 43:22, 44:6, 45:1, 45:2, 50:10, 56:24, 57:20, 59:3, 59:8, 60:2, 61:21, 66:15, 68:22 one-way [1] - 44:6 ongoing [1] - 34:1 open [3] - 7:21, 9:6, 34:21

opportunity [1] - 9:22

opposed [2] - 40:2, 40.8 **ORAL** [1] - 1:6 oranges [2] - 12:3, 12:6 order [36] - 6:24, 6:25, 9:19, 9:24, 10:2, 11:22, 15:9, 16:15, 18:19, 19:23, 23:2, 25:25, 31:14, 36:10, 49:17, 52:5, 54:8, 54:13, 55:3, 55:20, 56:4, 56:9, 56:13, 62:6, 63:1, 63:8, 64:1, 66:8, 66:18, 68:24, 70:7, 71:1, 72:1, 72:12, 72:14, 74:11 ordered [4] - 61:14, 63:10, 68:11, 74:4 ordering [1] - 68:12 orders [1] - 33:8 original [1] - 33:18 originally [1] - 48:6 Orleans [1] - 3:4 otherwise [2] - 36:17, ought [1] - 23:14 outstanding [2] - 8:3, 8:16 overbroad [2] - 35:18, 35:21 overlap [1] - 60:6 overruled [5] - 31:20, 32:11, 35:10, 36:14, 58:14 own [12] - 14:21, 14:23, 15:1, 22:2, 27:7, 28:24, 40:25, 41:5, 46:2, 57:19, 68:17 Oxford [1] - 3:13

P

P.C [1] - 4:2 p.m [2] - 59:16, 74:24 PA [1] - 4:3 pace [1] - 29:3 page [7] - 12:12, 26:18, 26:23, 32:14, 32:23, 46:15, 55:24 Page [12] - 13:6, 13:8, 23:17, 30:18, 32:10, 46:10, 46:14, 56:21, 57:2, 68:6, 71:5, 71:19 pages [2] - 12:11, 29:8 paired [1] - 62:22

PAPANTONIO [1] -

1:16 paper [1] - 16:17 papers [1] - 66:10 Paragraph [9] - 11:22, 12:2, 15:8, 15:12, 15:14, 15:25, 16:3, 16:5. 23:2 paragraph [2] - 11:23, 35:3 Park [1] - 3:21 Parkway [2] - 1:14, 4:3 part [5] - 33:3, 51:12, 51:23, 70:3, 70:15 particular [41] - 10:24, 11:23, 12:15, 12:25, 15:3, 17:9, 18:23, 22:10, 25:21, 27:10, 30:20, 32:5, 32:6, 32:8, 34:24, 36:2, 36:3, 37:22, 38:23, 43:11, 44:24, 45:5, 45:25, 46:5, 46:17, 52:20, 57:23, 58:2, 58:3, 58:15, 59:3, 61:23, 61:24, 63:6, 63:13, 67:21, 68:2, 70:20, 71:1, 71:17, 72:14 particularize [1] -72:16 particularizing [1] -73:5 particularly [2] -57:17, 65:2 PARTIES [1] - 5:1 parties [12] - 6:22, 7:2, 8:23, 12:11, 27:19, 32:5, 54:19, 59:3, 59:5, 60:3, 60:8, 63:14 PARTIES' [1] - 1:7 parts [1] - 35:11 party's [1] - 31:21 past [5] - 6:5, 9:17, 30:21, 33:10, 35:3 **PC**[1] - 1:19 pencils [1] - 58:15 Pennsylvania [3] -1:21, 3:11, 3:14 Pensacola [1] - 1:18 people [12] - 5:5, 15:24, 17:3, 17:16, 40:9, 40:10, 40:20, 40:21, 42:13, 44:16, 59:13 per [2] - 20:17, 25:11 percent[1] - 69:11 perfect [1] - 60:21 perfectly [1] - 67:22

performed [2] - 18:9, 26:25 period [3] - 8:19, 18:4, 55:18 periods [1] - 48:10 permission [1] - 66:23 person [4] - 35:6, 35:14, 44:24, 72:12 personal [6] - 16:6, 46:10, 64:2, 64:5, 69:24, 70:2 perspective[2] -43:17, 55:15 PFS [3] - 66:20, 69:6, 69.9 Pharma [4] - 3:19, 4:4, 4:4 Pharmaceutical [1] -3:18 Pharmaceuticals [3] -3:18, 6:8, 59:21 pharmacies [1] -49.14 Pharmacy [1] - 6:10 pharmacy [1] - 52:2 Philadelphia [2] -1:21. 3:11 phone [7] - 5:6, 6:4, 39:6, 48:15, 51:17, 72:12, 72:15 photos [1] - 52:2 phrase [2] - 33:12, 39:12 physical [1] - 73:2 physician [1] - 65:16 physicians [1] - 51:3 pick[1] - 23:24 picked[1] - 26:7 picking [1] - 28:1 piece [2] - 16:17, 39:20 **Piedmont** [1] - 3:17 PIETRAGALLO [1] -3:12 pill [2] - 13:21, 21:14 pills [5] - 13:19, 38:23, 43:25, 44:3, 50:15 pinpoint [1] - 28:18 Pittsburgh [1] - 3:14 place [5] - 25:12, 30:6, 30:24, 31:12, 74:9 plaintiff [41] - 5:14, 12:13, 13:19, 14:10, 14:14, 17:7, 17:25, 21:14, 21:23, 21:24, 25:6, 25:11, 27:6, 28:19, 33:13, 33:15, 33:21, 34:4, 34:10, 37:2, 37:15, 45:11, 45:25, 46:5, 48:12,

53:22, 63:7, 63:14, 63:18, 63:24, 65:6, 65:18, 65:21, 67:10, 67:12, 69:16, 69:23, 69:24, 71:9, 71:11, 71:17 Plaintiff [19] - 1:15. 1:18, 1:21, 3:4, 3:8, 14:20, 38:21, 45:21, 49:11, 49:12, 50:6, 50:11, 52:1, 58:8, 64:16, 65:5, 67:18, 70:12, 71:13 plaintiff's [10] - 12:10, 13:21, 14:12, 21:15, 25:2, 27:7, 29:1, 59:18, 63:15, 64:25 plaintiff-specific [3] -21:14, 33:13, 33:15 plaintiffs [109] - 5:16, 5:18, 5:20, 5:22, 7:12, 10:15, 14:2, 16:3, 16:6, 16:15, 16:16, 17:9, 18:1, 18:3, 18:5, 18:7, 18:11, 18:12, 19:25, 20:13, 20:21, 21:2, 21:6, 23:8, 23:10, 23:21, 24:3, 24:8, 24:12, 24:16, 24:17, 24:20, 24:21, 25:1, 25:18, 25:19, 27:2, 27:12, 27:17, 27:18, 27:25, 28:4, 28:6, 28:9, 28:14, 28:16, 29:11, 29:12, 29:14, 30:6, 30:15, 33:12, 33:19, 34:2, 35:9, 36:7, 37:12, 39:11, 40:3, 42:3, 42:6, 42:8, 42:14, 43:1, 43:11, 44:12, 44:13, 44:18, 44:22, 45:5, 46:5, 48:2, 49:8, 49:9, 49:11, 49:12, 50:1, 50:3, 50:16, 50:20, 50:23, 51:10, 51:19, 53:8, 58:14, 60:21, 61:2, 61:11, 61:15, 62:15, 63:9, 63:25, 64:2, 64:5, 64:18, 65:10, 65:25, 66:1, 66:2, 66:18, 67:24, 68:12, 68:13, 69:7, 70:6, 70:14, 71:25, 72:20 Plaintiffs [2] - 42:16, 58:11 plaintiffs' [8] - 22:4, 22:20, 43:17, 48:5, 51:3, 52:16, 63:23,

41:1, 50:1, 51:20

72:23 Plaintiffs' [4] - 43:1, 43:5, 43:6, 71:3 plan [3] - 14:12, 16:25, 54:19 platform [1] - 33:7 **PLLC**[1] - 3:5 plus [2] - 15:25, 25:15 point [11] - 8:4, 12:23, 13:17, 16:8, 18:1, 18:12, 45:1, 55:11, 61:11, 69:3, 70:19 pointed [1] - 54:6 points [2] - 29:24, 39:16 popcorn [1] - 34:6 portions [1] - 7:24 position [20] - 17:20, 23:4, 29:12, 29:15, 33:9, 33:22, 35:8, 36:21, 37:24, 38:1, 38:2, 38:7, 42:24, 46:22, 47:14, 48:5, 49:20, 49:21, 65:11, 69:18 positions [1] - 31:21 positive [1] - 43:9 possession [7] -38:20, 39:18, 40:25, 41:7, 52:3, 71:16, 71:22 possible [2] - 59:15, 59:22 possibly [1] - 12:20 potentially [6] - 22:3, 25:10, 36:17, 37:5, 38:14, 38:17 practical [2] - 24:25, 25:4 practice [2] - 32:3, 70:6 preceding [1] - 50:8 precise[1] - 20:18 precisely [1] - 63:9 preface [1] - 13:4 **preference**[1] - 61:10 premature [2] - 46:22, 53:18 prepare [1] - 23:24 prepared [2] - 21:5, 29:23 prescription [1] - 18:5 prescriptions [1] -16:18 present[2] - 63:25, 66:7 press [1] - 23:20 pressed[1] - 56:16 pretty [2] - 20:22, 64:18

previously [1] - 36:1 pricing [12] - 33:17, 33:24, 34:2, 34:12, 34:25, 56:22, 58:21, 59:6, 59:14, 60:3, 60:9, 73:13 primarily [1] - 65:16 primary [1] - 65:16 printout[1] - 23:20 **priorities** [1] - 63:11 prioritization [6] -60:19, 61:4, 61:12, 61:15, 62:14, 74:3 prioritize [5] - 9:9, 61:9, 62:16, 62:18, 63:3 prioritized [1] - 61:17 prioritizes [1] - 62:22 prioritizing [2] -60:24, 62:21 priority [3] - 62:6, 63:1, 74:13 problem [7] - 48:8, 60:24, 61:1, 63:6, 63:13, 63:17, 64:7 problematic [1] -72:22 problems [1] - 11:20 procedure [1] - 52:10 proceed [1] - 25:20 proceedings [2] -54:13, 75:3 Proceedings [1] -1:25 process [9] - 22:18, 34:11, 49:2, 50:4, 50:18, 53:4, 53:6, 64:20, 72:7 produce [13] - 7:7, 7:19, 10:14, 16:16, 23:22, 28:1, 32:2, 36:9, 36:10, 45:3, 51:20, 52:15, 61:16 produced [12] - 2:1, 8:25, 16:19, 22:9, 24:7, 24:17, 30:7, 52:15, 53:24, 62:10, 62:11, 69:25 produces [1] - 27:17 producing [2] - 8:12, 23:11 product [29] - 11:3. 11:25, 13:15, 13:23, 14:3, 14:4, 15:22, 16:18. 17:9. 17:13. 17:24, 17:25, 18:8, 19:20, 20:15, 20:20, 21:21, 21:25, 22:13,

22:19, 22:22, 23:9,

27:2, 28:19, 40:16,

product's [1] - 22:7 production [15] - 7:4, 7:8, 8:6, 8:17, 9:6, 9:12, 9:25, 12:7, 12:10, 31:15, 34:18, 34:20, 56:10, 60:24, 63:3 productions [2] -22:2, 22:24 productive [2] - 59:7, 60:7 products [2] - 28:3, 68:25 **PRODUCTS**[1] - 1:4 project [1] - 19:20 propose [2] - 49:8, 49:9 proposed [6] - 7:14, 14:14, 48:6, 48:7, 50:21, 61:24 proposes [1] - 59:4 prospective [2] -35:14, 35:17 protection [1] - 67:25 prove [4] - 19:20, 27:7, 70:9, 70:16 provide [33] - 9:24, 9:25, 12:23, 13:12, 13:23, 14:11, 17:24, 19:4, 19:9, 19:17, 19:25, 21:14, 21:21, 22:7, 25:7, 27:12, 36:25, 41:16, 48:16, 49:24, 50:14, 51:11, 61:15, 65:6, 65:7, 65:10, 65:18, 67:14, 68:11, 68:13, 68:16, 69:24, 70:15 provided [14] - 14:20, 20:4, 41:24, 46:20, 46:24, 51:12, 61:1, 64:15, 68:3, 68:19, 70:2, 70:10, 70:12, 72:1 provider [4] - 65:5, 65:7, 66:15, 66:17 providers [7] - 65:10, 65:14, 66:23, 67:2, 67:8, 67:14, 67:17 providing [2] - 66:21, 67:15 proving [1] - 29:1 proviso [2] - 34:18, 58:14 purchase [1] - 33:8 purposes [2] - 5:12, 66:8 pursuant [2] - 15:8, 16:15

push_[2] - 52:21, 58:4 pushed_[1] - 44:9 put_[4] - 51:17, 66:9, 70:13, 70:24

Q

qualified [1] - 74:7 quality [4] - 62:7, 62:8, 62:17, 62:18 querying [1] - 20:23 questions [30] - 10:13, 10:16, 10:23, 12:15, 12:25, 13:2, 13:6, 13:7, 13:9, 13:13, 13:14, 18:14, 19:1, 19:5, 19:23, 20:7, 20:13, 21:22, 22:1, 23:15, 25:14, 25:21, 26:1, 26:5, 26:13, 36:23, 36:24, 41:25, 54:12, 57:9 quickly [1] - 30:13 quite [9] - 10:10, 12:1, 18:12, 19:21, 49:23, 52:13, 57:21, 58:5, 60:20 quote [4] - 17:14, 37:5, 37:8, 54:22

R

raise [4] - 6:22, 7:2,

45:15, 73:20 RAISED[1] - 1:6 **RASPANTI**[1] - 3:12 rate[1] - 64:17 rather [1] - 66:15 **RE** [1] - 1:4 reach [3] - 44:5, 45:16, 45:19 reached [1] - 44:12 read [4] - 10:11, 33:1, 60:19, 68:1 reading [4] - 58:8, 66:10, 66:20, 67:6 real [1] - 21:20 really [15] - 10:22, 11:4, 11:14, 19:1, 20:19, 21:11, 30:5, 30:11, 35:18, 44:20, 50:1. 50:18. 51:2. 64:25, 73:15 reason [5] - 20:14, 41:2, 41:20, 44:9, 49:24 reasonable [12] -30:16, 43:14, 51:8, 54:9, 54:14, 59:23,

63:2, 63:8, 63:11,

63:14, 67:22, 68:15

recalled [6] - 36:17, 36:19, 37:3, 38:3, 38:13, 38:16 receive [4] - 7:23, 7:24, 8:2, 18:3 received [14] - 6:17, 8:13. 13:19. 15:2. 18:5, 18:7, 20:12, 21:23, 28:9, 28:16, 44:22, 45:22, 50:16, 53:12 receiving [1] - 20:7 recently [1] - 50:23 recited [1] - 11:23 recognize [1] - 53:15 reconvene [1] - 74:18 record [7] - 5:3, 39:13, 53:22, 69:22, 74:5, 74:9, 75:3 recorded [1] - 1:25 records [7] - 20:16, 52:2, 57:19, 57:21, 58:6, 70:7, 70:8 redline [5] - 13:10, 26:17, 31:6, 32:13, 42:2 redlines [1] - 13:1 referring [3] - 23:17, 27:11, 40:15 refill [1] - 18:5 reflected [1] - 42:2 refused [1] - 40:16 regained [1] - 39:18 regard [9] - 8:23, 17:12, 51:10, 59:13, 59:14, 71:15, 72:2, 72:10, 74:4 regarding [12] - 9:20, 16:17, 29:8, 33:17, 41:25, 42:11, 42:19, 42:21, 47:13, 53:16, 56:22, 72:17 regards [3] - 6:23, 27:10, 51:19 regulatory [2] - 62:9, 62:10 relate [5] - 17:9, 28:3, 29:10, 29:14, 30:20 related [2] - 9:17, 12:3 relates [4] - 12:2, 22:10, 30:9, 31:10 relationship [1] -15:11 relatively [2] - 41:21, 70:19 relevant [16] - 7:6, 7:14, 8:11, 8:19,

14:4, 22:3, 22:21,

28:5, 29:1, 39:20,

44:16, 57:17, 58:10,

68:16, 68:25, 70:20 remember [5] - 18:2, 28:22, 44:19, 49:25, 63:19 repeat [7] - 29:21, 38:9, 41:12, 51:14, 64:4. 64:11. 68:7 report [3] - 33:4, 46:21, 46:25 reporter [8] - 5:8, 5:11, 29:21, 41:12, 51:17, 64:4, 64:11, 74.19 Reporter [2] - 1:23, 68:7 Reporter/ Transcriber [1] -75:5 reports [1] - 33:20 representation[1] -21:5 representatives [2] -16:4, 69:11 represented[1] represents [1] - 45:22 reproduction [1] -12:6 Request [1] - 33:20 request[17] - 7:18, 7:23, 11:19, 27:20, 31:15, 32:6, 33:18, 34:13, 47:18, 67:3, 67:12, 67:13, 67:17, 68:18, 71:8, 71:10, 74:7 requested [3] - 33:19, 43:24, 47:20 requesting [1] - 23:8 requests [8] - 11:10, 33:21, 33:22, 33:25, 45:2, 47:10, 47:12, 53:7 require [9] - 27:19, 32:4, 43:14, 45:2, 51:6, 57:20, 71:12, 71:25, 73:15 required [5] - 31:16, 39:21, 52:1, 69:8, 69:16 requires [2] - 22:1, 68:1 requiring [1] - 24:25 reserve[2] - 34:24, 55:17 reserved [1] - 73:13 resolve 131 - 30:13. 64:13, 72:24 resolved [4] - 29:4,

54:23, 64:9, 73:1

respect[2] - 7:17, 34.19 respective [1] - 31:21 respectively[1] -14:18 respond [8] - 14:21, 26:18, 27:5, 32:8, 47:24, 52:5, 53:19, 71:13 responding [1] - 69:2 response [3] - 35:5, 50:25, 56:3 responses [1] - 20:8 responsive [3] -27:19, 32:6, 42:21 result [3] - 28:18, 35:4, 38:20 results [5] - 22:9, 28:9, 37:7, 37:11, 74.8 retailer [9] - 6:10, 16:23, 16:24, 17:2, 18:22, 19:3, 53:1, 53:9, 53:20 Retailer [1] - 19:11 retailer/wholesaler [3] - 53:23, 54:21, 55:2 retailers [7] - 14:16, 14:19, 14:21, 19:9, 48:19, 48:23, 49:3 retailers' [1] - 56:3 retrievable [1] - 58:4 return [2] - 41:11, 47:25 returned [3] - 38:20, 40:5, 41:1 review [2] - 22:1, 22:9 revisions [1] - 53:12 rights [1] - 44:2 ripe [2] - 63:25, 66:10 ripened [1] - 66:3 risk[1] - 11:13 RMR [1] - 75:5 Road [1] - 3:17 rolled [1] - 20:25 rolling [6] - 7:8, 7:19, 8:6, 9:6, 9:12, 9:25 Roman [3] - 30:18, 31:5, 32:10 Roseland [1] - 1:15 **RUBEN**[1] - 1:20 Ruben [1] - 5:21 Rule [3] - 53:7, 53:10, 53:14 rule [1] - 53:15 ruled [3] - 23:5, 41:9, 45:20 rules [3] - 34:19, 67:21, 70:10

ruling [8] - 9:16,

15:16, 26:16, 31:19, 36:1, 36:13, 41:15, 68:2 **RULINGS** [1] - 1:6 rustle [1] - 11:6 S sails [2] - 38:7, 68:20 sale [2] - 13:25, 19:7 sales [13] - 33:17, 33:24, 34:2, 34:12, 34:17, 34:20, 34:25, 56:22, 58:21, 59:6, 59:14, 60:3, 60:8 samples [1] - 39:10 Sarah [3] - 6:10. 52:25. 54:24 **SARAH**[1] - 3:20 scanning [1] - 73:12 schedule [2] - 6:19, 60:18 62:25 scope [3] - 15:15, 19:18, 31:24 search [13] - 20:2, 46:3, 46:10, 56:13 second [9] - 12:17,

36:22 save[2] - 11:13, 26:19 Schneider [2] - 47:16, **SCHNEIDER** [1] - 1:11 42:10, 42:13, 42:15, 42:20, 43:10, 44:16, 44:21, 44:23, 45:24, 25:4, 26:22, 32:17, 70:25, 72:2 37:3, 39:8, 39:23, 68:4. 68:5 section [2] - 31:10. 70:21 Section [4] - 23:17. 30:24, 31:4, 37:4 sections [2] - 32:24, 67:5 see [12] - 10:8, 13:8, 70:12 24:12, 26:17, 38:16, 46:23, 47:6, 59:8, 60:12, 61:17, 61:23, 73:14 seeing [3] - 18:4, 71:13 64:17, 66:1 seek[1] - 71:12 seeking [2] - 25:3, 25:7 sell [1] - 21:9 sells [1] - 20:17 send [5] - 43:23, 43:25, 44:2, 60:12, 69:5 72:18, 72:22 sense[11] - 6:25, short[1] - 31:9 12:11, 12:25, 23:25,

25:23, 26:11, 40:6, 40:7, 42:12, 60:21, 61:13 sent [4] - 11:9, 24:3, 36:25, 45:3 Sentry [1] - 4:3 separate [2] - 59:2, 73:16 served [2] - 33:19. 45:12 serves [1] - 49:12 set [6] - 7:1, 7:20, 13:6, 57:16, 59:22, 62:6 **SETH**[1] - 3:9 Seth [2] - 5:24, 60:25 several [5] - 10:23, 18:7, 28:17, 32:24, shared [1] - 64:24 **sharpen** [1] - 58:15 sheet [39] - 12:2, 13:18, 15:12, 15:14, 15:15, 18:15, 23:7, 34:23, 40:1, 45:25, 47:11, 47:20, 48:5, 49:17, 50:25, 51:1, 51:5, 52:5, 52:6, 52:12, 54:7, 54:10, 54:14, 55:10, 55:11, 55:14, 55:18, 56:4, 56:9, 56:24, 56:25, 58:19, 66:16, 67:25, 70:20, 70:21, 70:23, Sheet [23] - 14:20, 14:21, 15:21, 19:19, 22:16, 36:23, 37:13, 39:22, 39:24, 43:1, 46:23, 48:13, 49:11, 49:12, 49:14, 50:6, 50:8, 52:1, 56:5, 57:10, 65:6, 67:18, **Sheets** [11] - 10:8, 19:11, 20:9, 43:5, 43:7, 50:10, 50:12, 63:18, 64:16, 71:3, sheets [17] - 10:14, 14:15, 14:24, 20:10, 22:12, 28:22, 35:19, 53:16, 53:19, 53:23, 54:21, 55:2, 56:16, 66:19, 71:24, 72:5 **shifting** [1] - 28:25 Short [4] - 72:8, 72:15, **show**[3] - 23:9, 64:1,

66:8 showing [1] - 66:1 shown [1] - 13:14 side [2] - 26:23, 59:18 sides [2] - 30:16, 39:11 sign [1] - 44:2 **significant** [1] - 69:25 signing [1] - 66:22 similar [3] - 9:6, 15:17, 33:19 similarly [1] - 37:3 simple [1] - 43:8 simplify [1] - 48:15 simply [1] - 62:5 single [2] - 32:24, 48:12 situation [2] - 50:13, 52:8 six [1] - 52:23 skip [1] - 60:18 **SLATER** [13] - 1:13, 1:14, 5:15, 7:9, 10:18, 12:5, 29:18, 29:22, 31:4, 31:7, 59:18, 74:2, 74:15 Slater [11] - 5:15, 7:1, 7:8, 10:10, 13:17, 27:9, 27:16, 29:6, 29:17, 74:2, 74:13 Slater's [6] - 6:24, 7:3, 23:16, 26:15, 56:21, 73:8 sleeves [1] - 20:25 small [1] - 25:8 smoother [1] - 52:11 sold [1] - 19:6 solvent [5] - 57:6, 57:23, 58:2, 58:3 solvents [7] - 57:15, 57:16, 57:17, 57:25, 58:2, 58:9, 58:15 **someone** [1] - 48:22 sometimes [2] - 39:7. 43:21 somewhat [2] - 15:17, 61:4 soon [1] - 9:8 sorry [8] - 8:3, 27:22, 27:25, 43:4, 46:14, 48:3, 51:13, 56:24 sort [5] - 8:2, 13:4, 18:22, 22:23, 73:7 sound [1] - 15:17 sounds [3] - 8:5, 23:3, 54:5 speaker[1] - 64:7 speaking [3] - 6:5, 51:16, 54:5 specific [19] - 11:18,

THORNBURG [1] -

thoughts [2] - 58:22,

thousand [2] - 28:11,

3:20

72:9

5:4, 5:6, 5:7, 5:11,

9:19, 10:7, 10:11,

5:23, 6:15, 7:5, 8:4,

8:22, 9:2, 9:16, 9:18,

11:20, 11:22, 11:24,

12:9, 12:13, 13:2, 13:20, 15:2, 21:14, 22:3, 22:24, 23:15, 26:2, 29:24, 33:13, 33:15, 62:21, 63:10, 67:23, 68:12, 68:13 specifically [6] -10:17, 12:12, 30:12, 33:24, 65:6, 67:11 specification [1] -65:5 specifics [3] - 10:20, 10:21, 12:9 speculation [1] -45:21 speed [1] - 60:13 spot [1] - 25:8 spreadsheet[1] - 11:9 spreadsheets [1] -11:12 stage [2] - 17:15, 69:1 stance[1] - 37:11 standpoint [3] - 25:4, 25:5, 37:20 **STANOCH**[1] - 71:2 Stanoch [1] - 34:6 start [10] - 5:14, 6:23. 7:3, 7:14, 8:11, 8:18, 13:10, 14:19, 49:15, 52:21 started [1] - 31:23 starts [5] - 8:7, 35:4, 42:2, 47:6, 49:13 state [5] - 5:8, 8:22, 11:16, 35:4, 66:3 states [1] - 74:8 STATES [2] - 1:2, 1:11 States [3] - 15:2, 21:11, 45:4 stenography [1] -1:25 still [8] - 9:11, 12:16, 19:11, 37:14, 38:24, 46:13, 52:23, 53:19 stop [3] - 15:5, 23:12, 45:16 store [1] - 33:3 stored [1] - 33:14 Street [4] - 1:20, 3:3, 3:10, 3:24 struck[1] - 31:20 **structure**[1] - 63:15 Sub [1] - 30:25 subset[1] - 43:11 substantive[1] -26:20 sue [1] - 73:6 sufficient [3] - 48:17, 58:24, 64:20 suggest [5] - 6:23,

49:7, 59:2, 61:20, suggestion [1] - 55:7 suing [1] - 72:16 Suite [6] - 1:17, 1:20, 3:7, 3:17, 3:21, 4:3 suite [1] - 3:24 **summarize** [1] - 69:12 summary [1] - 68:18 superficially [1] -72:11 superior [1] - 31:12 supplemented [1] -74:14 supplied [1] - 35:4 supplier [2] - 57:22, 58:3 suppliers [1] - 58:1 supply [11] - 13:20, 14:3, 14:13, 14:16, 14:24, 15:4, 17:3, 17:25, 21:23, 50:7, suppose [1] - 73:19 supposed [2] - 45:19, 48:24 suspect[2] - 23:19, 59:10 sustained [5] - 34:22, 38:18, 47:2, 47:17, 47.21 symbol [1] - 35:3

T

tabled [1] - 53:8 tables [1] - 53:13 talks [1] - 66:17 tally [1] - 25:1 team [1] - 63:23 teed[1] - 53:7 **TELEPHONE** [1] - 5:1 **telephone** [1] - 1:8 term [1] - 35:18 terms [3] - 37:9, 66:1, 68:23 territory [1] - 45:21 test [3] - 11:8, 28:9, 35:4 tested [1] - 37:21 testing [13] - 22:9, 26:25, 28:2, 28:5, 28:18, 29:8, 29:9, 31:13, 37:6, 37:7, 37:10, 38:25, 74:8 tests [1] - 22:10 Teva[4] - 3:18, 3:18, 6:3, 21:9 **THE** [2] - 1:2, 1:11 **The court** [170] - 5:3,

12:14, 13:3, 14:5, 15:5, 15:11, 15:16, 15:20, 15:23, 16:11, 16:22, 17:2, 17:7, 17:12, 17:19, 18:17, 18:19, 19:23, 20:22, 21:2, 21:5, 21:17, 23:5, 23:6, 23:12, 23:14, 24:14, 25:15, 25:25, 26:7, 26:14, 26:19, 27:9, 27:15, 27:20, 27:24, 28:12, 29:3, 29:5, 29:17, 30:1, 30:17, 31:1, 31:5, 31:8, 31:19, 31:20, 33:22, 34:4, 34:7, 34:8, 34:19, 34:22, 35:17, 35:25, 36:5, 36:6, 36:9, 36:14, 37:15, 38:6, 38:12, 39:1, 39:5, 39:9, 40:2, 40:8, 40:19, 41:3, 41:8, 41:21, 42:4, 43:4, 43:8, 44:11, 45:20, 46:12, 46:16, 46:20, 47:2, 47:7, 47:12, 47:16, 48:1, 48:4, 48:18, 49:3, 49:6, 49:16, 49:19, 51:9, 51:15, 51:17, 51:23, 52:4, 52:5, 53:2, 53:21, 54:16, 55:1, 55:3, 55:20, 56:6, 56:8, 56:12, 56:15, 57:3, 57:7, 57:13, 58:7, 58:13, 58:20, 58:23, 59:13, 59:25, 60:2, 60:11, 61:14, 61:19, 62:3, 62:12, 62:25, 63:10, 64:9, 64:12, 65:20, 66:5, 66:7, 66:14, 66:17, 67:20, 67:21, 68:2, 68:8, 68:11, 69:10, 69:15, 69:21, 70:18, 70:25, 71:4, 71:14, 71:25, 72:8, 73:3, 73:13, 74:12, 74:16, 74:19 themselves [2] - 37:7, they've [8] - 9:9, 18:7, 42:7, 42:18, 43:23, 44:8, 61:10, 66:16 third [2] - 32:23, 70:4

38:9 thousands [1] - 23:22 three [2] - 48:9, 49:2 three-tier [1] - 49:2 throughout[1] - 38:8 tier [2] - 49:2, 49:13 tight [1] - 65:13 time-consuming [3] -22:17, 50:4, 50:17 timed [1] - 50:25 timing [2] - 26:21, 52:17 today [6] - 9:11, 12:20, 48:14, 64:9, 64:13, 65:3 together [5] - 48:24, 52:18, 72:13, 73:4, 73:23 took [4] - 11:24, 28:17, 37:2, 52:11 topics [1] - 6:5 Torrent[2] - 21:10, 62:17 total [1] - 16:2 touch [2] - 9:22, 44:9 toward [1] - 14:15 towards [3] - 13:15, 14:16, 30:12 trace [7] - 10:23, 13:18, 14:2, 15:3, 17:25, 18:23, 23:9 traceability [5] - 17:8, 17:13, 18:20, 19:25, 31:22 tracing [3] - 11:25, 19:20, 20:15 track [3] - 19:16, 43:14, 45:23 tracked [1] - 41:19 trailing [1] - 53:4 transactional [1] -33:9 transcript[2] - 2:1, 75:2 transcription [1] - 2:1 **Traurig** [2] - 6:3, 63:22 TRAURIG [1] - 3:15 treating [2] - 65:15 tree[1] - 11:7 trial [3] - 30:12, 43:19, 45:14 tried [2] - 44:5, 45:15 trigger [4] - 49:6, 50:5, 55:25, 56:17 triggered [1] - 56:19

triggering [1] - 49:10 TRISCHLER [3] -3:13, 6:7, 59:20 Trischler [2] - 6:8, 59:21 trivial [1] - 64:22 truthfully [1] - 22:16 try [9] - 11:4, 13:18, 18:19, 25:16, 29:13, 33:12, 39:8, 52:17, 72:23 trying [6] - 10:23, 11:21, 12:16, 14:2, 30:11, 43:18 turn [3] - 17:19, 27:15, 29:5 turnaround [1] - 48:9 two [14] - 6:19, 10:20, 18:25, 19:1, 19:23, 24:23, 32:16, 39:16, 50:21, 61:23, 64:9, 64:12, 66:9, 72:3 type [12] - 14:1, 17:24, 20:18, 21:14, 25:6, 27:1, 27:3, 28:25, 33:13, 35:8, 49:22, 57:18 types [3] - 13:11, 25:13, 34:2

U

Ulmer[1] - 6:13 **ULMER**[1] - 3:23 ultimately [3] - 19:20, 27:6, 55:18 unacceptable [1] -72:11 under [7] - 19:11, 21:1, 28:11, 43:10, 43:13, 53:17, 70:10 understood [1] -27:23 undoubtedly [1] -32:3 undue [1] - 32:1 unfair [1] - 27:4 unfortunately [3] -9:13, 32:23, 47:8 unique [2] - 25:24, 56:25 uniquely [1] - 57:9 United [3] - 15:2, 21:11, 45:4 **UNITED** [2] - 1:2, 1:11 universe [1] - 29:9 unless [1] - 21:3 unlike [1] - 8:3 unquote [2] - 17:14, 54:22

up [26] - 12:9, 13:21, 14:24, 15:4, 17:3, 18:22, 19:12, 19:13, 20:25, 21:15, 25:1, 25:6, 27:25, 28:23, 28:24, 29:7, 29:19, 34:7, 40:11, 41:11, 50:9, 53:7, 56:21, 60:13, 60:16, 66:2 updated [1] - 24:13 upstream [1] - 54:12 upward [1] - 13:19 USA [2] - 3:18, 4:4 uses [1] - 57:16

V

vague[1] - 35:21 valiant [1] - 25:16 **VALSARTAN**[1] - 1:4 **Valsartan** [6] - 5:4, 13:24, 16:17, 18:3, 18:8, 28:11 verses [1] - 62:17 version [2] - 26:12, 31:6 versus [1] - 25:8 **VIA** [1] - 5:1 Via [1] - 1:8 Victoria [3] - 6:4, 63:21, 69:22 VICTORIA [1] - 3:16 view [2] - 25:16, 32:8 Vine [1] - 3:24 visibility [3] - 21:8, 21:12, 23:9 voluminous [1] - 32:2 voluntary [1] - 24:9

W

waiting [1] - 9:7 waive [1] - 44:2 Waleko [6] - 12:18, 41:11, 44:25, 55:22, 56:23, 72:19 **WALEKO** [62] - 3:10, 12:17, 13:8, 14:12, 15:10, 15:13, 16:2, 16:21, 16:25, 17:6, 17:11, 17:17, 17:22, 18:18, 18:25, 20:6, 21:7, 21:19, 23:13, 24:5, 24:23, 25:22, 26:10, 26:17, 26:22, 27:14, 27:22, 28:7, 28:14, 29:16, 32:13, 32:21, 33:6, 35:2, 35:21, 36:3, 36:12, 36:21, 38:11, 39:16,

40:4, 40:18, 42:1, 44:25, 46:8, 46:13, 46:18, 46:22, 47:5, 47:8, 47:23, 49:21, 51:13, 55:22, 56:7, 56:11, 56:23, 57:4, 57:8, 57:14, 58:18, 72:19

Walgreens [1] - 17:10 walk [1] - 10:21 Walmart [1] - 17:10 wants [3] - 5:9, 21:24, 29:4

warranted [1] - 73:17 waste[1] - 30:11 ways [1] - 61:6 wear[1] - 11:14 website [1] - 24:11 Wednesday [3] - 1:9, 59:15, 60:9 week [3] - 59:5, 60:11, 73:18 weeks [3] - 50:21, 63:5, 63:6 **WERNER** [1] - 4:2

WHITELEY [3] - 3:2, 3:2. 5:19 Whiteley [1] - 5:19 whole [2] - 16:12, 52:10 Wholesaler [1] - 19:11

19:3, 54:5, 56:3 wholesalers [6] -14:17, 14:22, 48:24, 49:3, 49:14, 55:6 Williamson [2] -29:19, 29:23

wholesaler [4] - 6:14,

wind [2] - 38:6, 68:20 withdrawn [1] - 33:25 withdrew [1] - 33:21 wording [1] - 26:2 words [5] - 16:16, 17:14, 18:21, 27:11,

31:22 works [4] - 14:13, 31:13, 57:24, 60:1 world [2] - 18:11,

56:13 worse[1] - 11:14 wrestling [1] - 11:21 written [2] - 57:14,

61:22

Y

year [2] - 65:9, 70:11 years [3] - 18:4, 18:6, 28:17 yes/no [1] - 20:10

yourself [1] - 24:18

Z

ZHP [8] - 3:11, 5:25, 12:18, 20:16, 28:10, 60:1, 62:15

United States District Court Camden, New Jersey